

5

R Newton D D Jan 14
929 Clinton-st

VOL. VII.

FEBRUARY, 1874.

No. 2.

THE
Reformed Church Monthly
AND
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

EDITED BY

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D.,

PROF. J. H. GOOD, D.D., Tiffin, Ohio,

AND

REV. PROF. J. H. KLEIN, Louisville, Ky.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
THE LITURGICAL QUESTION, - - - - -	55
IMMANUEL, - - - - -	65
WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT? - - - - -	70
THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND LANCASTER, - - - - -	73
THE DIVIDED HOUSE; OR, THE TWO TENDENCIES, - - - - -	77
MORE EVASIONS, - - - - -	81
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
THE UNITED STATES IN HISTORY, - - - - -	87
EULOGY—MILTON, - - - - -	91
COLLEGE ITEMS, - - - - -	94
EDITORS' DESK, - - - - -	95
BOOK NOTICES, - - - - -	99
MONTHLY SUMMARY, - - - - -	99

URSINUS COLLEGE:

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

TERMS: \$2.00 A YEAR, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. SIX COPIES IN CLUB, \$10.50.
NO SUBSCRIPTION TAKEN FOR LESS THAN A YEAR.

LANCASTER, PA.

PEARSOL & GEIST, PRINTERS, 22 SOUTH QUEEN STREET.

Postage on the Monthly, 3 Cents per Quarter, or 12 Cents a Year, paid in advance.

1874.
THE REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY
AND
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

The sixth volume of the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY commenced with the January number, 1873. With this volume its scope has been enlarged by incorporating with it a *Literary and Educational* Department, under the additional title given above. By this change it is believed the general value and interest of the Monthly will be greatly increased. In other respects the Monthly will be devoted to the same Religious and Ecclesiastical principles which led to its establishment. *Positively*, it will inculcate and maintain the *historical faith and practice of the Reformed Church*. *Negatively*, it will expose and contend against all attempts to change that faith and practice.

TERMS: Single Copies \$2.00 a year, in advance. In Clubs, 6 copies, \$10.50. No subscription taken for less than a year, and *no discontinuance until arrearages are paid*. Remit money by *Postal order on Philadelphia*, or by checks on Philadelphia or New York Banks. Back numbers and volumes supplied. Address

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,
Freeland, Montgomery County, Pa.

HYMNS AND PRAYERS
FOR SUNDAY SCHOOLS.


By J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D.

This is a careful collection of 35 of the best old and New Hymns, Anthems, &c., for Sunday Schools, with special provision for anniversary occasions. The idea of devout praise rules the selection, and the arrangement is according to the Church year as observed in the Reformed Church. The book has thus far given great satisfaction.

Price, per dozen, \$3.00. Single copy, 30 cts. Extra cloth, single copy, 50 cts.

Orders received by

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,
Freeland, Montgomery County, Pa.

 Please state definitely how the packages are to be sent. When ordered in single copies, by mail, four cents postage added to the above retail price of Hymn-book.

1848

BEGINNING OF A NEW YEAR.

1874

A GOOD TIME TO SUBSCRIBE FOR

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD;

A LARGE EIGHT-PAGE, FORTY-EIGHT COLUMN PAPER.

TERMS—\$2.00 a year. *Five copies for \$10.00, and one copy extra to persons sending us the Club.*

Our Premium list is FULL and LIBERAL, a copy of which can be had free on application.

The *Christian World* is a Family Religious Journal, aiming to represent the general mind of the Church on the living questions of the day; to be the bearer of a practical Gospel to the people, and keep such enterprises of Religion as Missions, Education, Church extension, etc., fresh before its readers. Its corps of contributors has been enlarged to include every section of the Church East and West, North and South. We have made arrangements also for Correspondence from our Principal Cities, and for Letters from several eminent Foreign Travelers. Our paper leaves the press on Wednesday of each week, so that it may reach the remotest subscriber by Saturday.

Address,

REV. S. MEASE, or CHRISTIAN WORLD,
176 and 178 Elm Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE
REFORMED CHURCH
MONTHLY.

VOL. VII.—FEBRUARY, 1874.—No. 2.

THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

[So many years have passed since the commencement of the controversy caused by the attempted ritualistic or high-church innovation in our church, that its earlier history and incidents connected therewith, are largely lost sight of, or unknown. And yet without some due knowledge of them, the ruling spirit and aim of those innovations cannot rightly be judged and understood. Some of the tracts and papers called forth by the controversy at its start, or in its earlier stages, have never been seen by many of our friends, and are out of print. And as a desire to read them has been expressed to us several times, we have concluded to republish them in successive issues of the *Monthly*, so as to put them within the reach of our readers.

Among the most important of such papers, are the *majority and minority reports* of the Liturgical Committee, submitted to the Synod of Chambersburg, in October, 1862. The majority report, which is commenced in this and the following pages, was prepared by Dr. J. W. Nevin, endorsed by a large majority of the Committee, and submitted to the Synod as stated above. It is to be taken, therefore, as a deliberate declaration of the views and aims of its author, and of those who gave it their assent and endorsement. It was the first explicit statement of the ruling views and aims of the leaders of the ritualistic movement, the first full announcement to the church of what they held on the subject, and desired to effect.

Its extremely radical and revolutionary character will be manifest. There is hardly one distinctive feature of evangelical Reformed worship or doctrine which it does not directly or implicitly ridicule and assail, and that in no delicate terms. Not only free prayer, but such directories of worship as the Palatine Liturgy, are made alike the butt of its sarcasm or its condemnation.

The real import and bearing of this Report never received the careful consideration which it demanded. As a bold declaration of dissatisfaction with the true spirit and character of the Reformed church, and of a desire, and a purpose also, materially to change both, it is a most offensive document. No one

who loves our church in its historical character can read it without pain and indignation.

It claims to be in harmony with instructions given to the Committee. How false this pretension is, may be seen from some of its own statements and admissions, and will appear still more clearly from our notes appended, and from the minority Report to follow it.

Whilst the Report nominally refers to the Provisional Liturgy of 1857, it really sets forth and defends the Lancaster ritualistic theory of worship, &c., as carried out in the New-order of Worship of 1866. The Provisional Liturgy was a very different sort of book. It contained the germs, indeed, of the later revised Order of Worship, but enveloped in such innocent folds, that few suspected what seems to have been intended by it.

Let this Report be carefully read and pondered. It will be found fully to sustain the charges of radical ritualistic and sacerdotal innovations which have been brought against the Mercersburg-Lancaster movement. The italicising and foot-notes are our own.—*Ed. Ref. Church Monthly.*]

THERE are two general conceptions of the meaning and purpose of a *Liturgy*, which need to be carefully distinguished in any effort which is made to provide for public worship in this way. The conceptions *agree* in this, that they are *alike* opposed to what is called the use of free prayer, in the ordinary sense of the term. But beyond that, they are *so unlike*, that *the difference* between them may be said to be *wider altogether than their common difference from worship in the free form*.*

1. In the first place, the notion of a Liturgy may be made to include simply *a mechanical directory of the manner in which the services of the sanctuary are to be conducted, with written forms of prayer and other public address, more or less full, thrown together in an outward and prevailing independent way.*

With very many, this is the only meaning of liturgical worship. A Liturgy in their view, is merely a Prayer Book, in which pre-composed forms are provided for different public occasions, to be used instead of any private productions brought out by the officiating minister at the time. Such a book may be constructed on different plans; may be more or less full; may have single prayers only, or a variety of prayers for the several different occasions of

*This is a very notable admission. It proves that the writer of the Tract, and the committee who endorsed it, saw and felt that *their* theory of worship was entirely opposed, not only to *free* prayer, but to such Liturgical usages as the Reformed church favored. They further confess that free prayer is in more harmony with the Reformed idea of worship, than their theory of worship. And for this theory they plead and argue in opposition to the doctrine and rules of their church, although they solemnly promised to uphold and defend the doctrines and rules of the church.

worship, and may be made of more or less binding authority, or be considered a mere pulpit convenience for altogether optional use. But through all such modifications the general conception remains the same. The Liturgy is a service book, a book of examples and forms, a mere collection of prayers.*

Much of the controversy ~~we~~ hear concerning the use of liturgies, turns on this notion of them altogether. It is a question simply between book-prayers, as they are called, and prayers without book, the manner and spirit of the worship being supposed to be in both cases substantially the same. Public addresses to God, in the name of the congregation, are held to be a necessary part of the worship of the sanctuary; it is the *business* of the minister to lead the people in these acts of devotion, at such times as the order of service requires; and the matter of debate then is, whether in the discharge of this function he should be left to his own free power and pleasure at the time, or make use of forms previously prepared and printed for the purpose.

In favor of free supplications it is contended, on the one side, that they tend to encourage and assist the spirit of devotion, and the gift of prayer in the officiating minister; that being produced from within at the moment, when they are offered, they may be expected to carry with them proper heart and life; that being wholly unshackled, they have the power of suiting themselves easily to existing circumstances and wants. On all of which points then, counterpart objections are urged against prescribed forms of prayer. They are mechanical, we are told, and run naturally into formality and cold lip service; they are not born immediately from the heart, but are the repetition or rehearsal only of what others have wrought out from the brain; they are necessarily general, allowing no room for such freedom, variety, and particularity, as the idea of prayer seems to require; they prevent the proper cultivation of what has been rightly denominated the gift of prayer, being in this view, at best, crutches only for the lame, and helps for the incompetent, the general use of which cannot but serve to extend and confirm the very weakness for which it thus offers itself as an indulgent relief. The argument throughout is directed against liturgies under the one single

*The kind of Liturgy here meant, is that approved by the Reformed church from the beginning, a Liturgy which, in a free way, should serve as a directory and guide of public worship, and yet allow full room for liberty under the spirit in prayer.

aspect of their being precomposed, fixed forms of prayer, in distinction from corresponding services of an extemporaneous and free character.

And so, also, on the other side, we have the cause of liturgies largely defended under precisely the same view. They are regarded as a security for the fitness, decency, and dignity of the public services of religion. If some ministers are well qualified to produce good prayers without any such outward help, it is certain that very many have not this qualification, and that to a large extent, accordingly, the function is discharged in a very unsatisfactory and most unedifying way. As a general thing, these free prayers are either themselves stereotyped private forms of thought and phraseology, into which the minister has fallen for himself, he can hardly tell how, or else irregular and desultory effusions which are entitled to but small regard on the score of either piety or sense. Why, it is asked, should the devotions of the congregation in this most important part of sanctuary worship, be at the mercy of a single mind, called to impart direction and shape to them at the time? It would be considered monstrous on all hands, if it were pretended to fasten the praises of the congregation in this way to the use of hymns dictated for them at the time by the minister, even allowing such hymns to have been carefully prepared by him for the purpose beforehand. Why, then, should it seem right to commit the solemn service of prayer to such dictation, not generally premeditated, but determined for the most part by the impulses of the moment? Is it right that the whole assembly of God's worshiping people, in thus coming before him and calling upon his name, should be made *to hang not only on the mouth* of the minister, but upon his mind and heart also, for the way in which the approach is made? Is it right that his uncertain powers, his varying frames and dispositions, his humors and caprices, his individual opinions, fancies and prejudices, his peculiarities of thought and diction, should be allowed to thrust themselves in continually as a medium between those who pray, and Him to whom prayer is made, coloring and refracting the universal devotion thus to their own tone? Surely, to one considering the matter properly, this must be counted a worse bondage for the congregation than any which is imposed by the fixed forms of a prayer-book. The confinement of a liturgy, composed with premeditation and care, and accurately understood before-

hand, may justly be regarded as liberty itself, in comparison with any such necessity of following the random lead of another, without ~~any~~ previous knowledge whatever of its extemporized turns and starts. Of all sorts of tyrannical rule, indeed, the most slavish always is that which owns no law, and moves in no fixed orbit, but stands only in the arbitrary will and pleasure of the individual by whom it is exercised. Better in any case an objective form than a purely subjective despotism. It is a great misnomer to call extemporary prayer free. For a congregation, it is just the opposite of this, in proportion precisely as it recedes from the character of some generally acknowledged, though unwritten form, and affects to be wholly original and independent. Your *ranting expectorations*, born from the feeling of the moment, and your eloquently sentimental harangues to the Deity, got up to please the ears of a refined audience, are both alike, in this view, an outrage upon the true freedom of Christian worship.*

Looking at the matter in this way, the advocates of liturgical worship, in the sense now under consideration, are not willing to allow, of course, that the other system has the advantage of being less outward and more full of devotional life. The use of forms is not necessarily a dead quiescence in forms. There is no reason why the spirit of devotion may not flow actively in such channels of prayer, as well as in the corresponding channels of praise which are offered to it by the spiritual songs of the sanctuary. Nay, on any right view of the case, it will be found that long established, long familiar forms of worship, have a far greater fitness for devotional use than such as are strange and new. There are no such vehicles of pious sensibility as old hymns, old prayers, old religious utterances generally. It is not true that they serve to generate and encourage lifeless formality. Where the spirit of religion is wanting, they may, indeed, furnish opportunity for this abuse; just as the sameness of the Scriptures may become a soporific drug in the same way. But who would think of meeting and correcting this difficulty in the case of the Bible, by throwing the Bible continually into new forms and versions? The old text, for those who

*In this entire rabid paragraph, the writer and his committee *seem* to be stating objections made by others to free prayer. But they are really their own objections. The whole description of free prayer is a shameful caricature. And when it is remembered that what the writer thus rails at, has been the prevailing practice of our church for hundreds of years, that it was the way in which our fathers prayed and taught the people to pray, the railing of the report is simply an outrage upon decency, and upon the memory of our honored dead.

have been all their lives familiar with it, is ever for all devotional purposes the best text. And so is it also with hymns and prayers, catechisms and creeds. Where there is any susceptibility for religious emotions or affections, old formularies, embalmed, as it were, in the sacred memories of the past, are always better adapted to call it into exercise than any that are modern and new. Novelty and variety may stir the understanding, or please the fancy; but they have no power to feed the inward life of the soul. That seeks rather communion with the past, and an intensive appropriation of what is already at hand. Here, emphatically, that word is true: "No man having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new; for he saith, *the old is better.*" In religion, the law is universal. Religious sentiment, actually at work in the soul, seeks and finds its most natural outlet always in forms of thought and language which need no invention, but are already at hand, consecrated for the purpose, and made solemnly familiar by long use.*

Such liturgical forms, in this view, have an immense educational work. It is of vast account to have the mind stored from the beginning with the wholesome words of sound doctrine and right religious feeling, even where the sense of them may not be at first properly perceived or duly laid to heart. Especially important is it, we may say, that such preoccupation of the mind should be secured in the way of forms which utter and act forth, not simply the knowledge of religion, but its actual power and life—the faith of the church in this manner going before the faith of her infants and children, her novices and catechumens, and struggling to form itself in them as the hope of glory. "As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them up, beareth them on her wings," so doth this holy mother of us all fulfill here her sublime office of winning the fledglings of baptismal grace to a true heavenward flight. There is no teaching in religion like this *in-forming* process, which puts into the soul, with divine authority, the outward word of religion, in order to make room for the coming of the same word in its inward power and glory. If it may be said with truth, that the familiar songs and ballads of a nation are of more power for the character of it than its laws, there is still more room to affirm of these

*All this is mere plausible deception. The writer, as he often does, sets up a misrepresentation that he may blind people to actual facts. He picks out bad exceptions to suit his purpose, and so as to have something to strike at.

established forms of Christian belief and worship, that they go far beyond all other modes of culture in determining what turns out to be at last the actual institution of nominally Christian men. Catechisms for the young, in this way, are of more account than systems of theology for the old. Hymns are perpetual sermons. Texts of Scripture stuck in the mind like proverbs, enforce their own lessons, where all commentaries are dumb or forgotten. What a world of education is comprehended, in this way, in the articles of the Creed, and in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. Do *they* lose their force by repetition? Are *they* formal, because they are familiar? Would it be an improvement to have them continually in new paraphrases and versions, or to have them superseded altogether by free effusions extemporized for the same purpose and use? There is irony, as all can at once feel, in the very question. These simple formularies are powerful for the purposes of devotion and faith, just because they echo in the same words always, from childhood to old age, and from one century onward to another, what has been the universal worship of the one Catholic church through all times. And why should we not learn from this the importance of uniform liturgical services generally, for the best kind of religious training, that namely which casts the mind from the beginning into the very mould of the "things which are most surely believed" among Christians, and stamps it at the same time with their ineffaceable image and superscription? A good Liturgy is an organ of religious education, more efficient even than a good Catechism or a good confession of faith. It reaches farther and works deeper. The Prayer-book of the Church of England has more to do with her theological spirit than the Thirty-nine Articles. Every church needs such a help in her prophetic office, even if she might afford to undervalue it in her priestly office. Without it, her educational apparatus, at best, can never be more than half complete.*

*Much of what is here said would be readily admitted. But his own purpose carries the writer entirely too far. Written, prescribed Liturgies, have never been found more powerful to preserve orthodoxy and to promote true piety than the system of free prayer. The Episcopal church of England has had what is generally considered one of the best liturgies ever prepared, so that our committee made it almost the model of their own. And yet that very church is more corrupted with error in doctrine and practice than any other nominally protestant evangelical church in that country. In like manner we may ask, were the Lutheran churches of Europe preserved from rationalism and irreligion by being much more liturgical than the Reformed? Where have Puseyism and Pantheism most prevailed? And once more, what power has the "Apostles' Creed" to keep Lancaster theology from running into all sorts of fantastic notions, even to the extent of Pantheism, notwithstanding the great veneration for that creed professed by Lancaster?

Here, then, the friends of free worship are themselves put on their defence, in a case where they have been trying to make out a charge of religious indifference against the other side. If there be any truth in what has now been said, the system for which they plead as being most favorable to the life and power of religion, is opposed to one of the most necessary conditions of all true Christian prosperity and growth. Unliturgical churches can have no full sympathy with the idea of educational religion, and it must necessarily suffer deplorable neglect at their hands. If they lay any stress at all on religious training, it will be in the view of it which makes it to be only a proper course of instruction in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. But important as this may be, it is by no means the whole, nor yet the main part, of what we are to understand by educational religion. This does not consist in lessons simply for the understanding, or in precepts for the right conduct of life; it is the living discipline of the soul rather into the very form and habit of religion itself—what St. Paul calls the bringing up of Christian children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Such education calls for the use of the Catechism; but it requires yet more the use of positive acts of devotion in fixed liturgical forms. These are as necessary to the growth of piety in children, as their daily meals are to the growth of their bodies. But for this there can be no proper provision, of course, in churches which eschew liturgies altogether, and look upon them as narcotics rather than tonics for the religious life. Even so far as they may find it necessary to allow any education of the sort in the simple prayers of the nursery, it will be with the feeling that all such worship is a mechanical go-cart merely, which must as soon as possible be laid aside, in order to make room for worship in a free, self-moving form; while the services of the sanctuary are so ordered, as from the beginning to force the tender mind of childhood into another manner of religious culture altogether. In circumstances like these, the idea of Christian nurture is shorn of its whole significance and force; and it will be found, accordingly, that these unliturgical churches, as a general thing, make no earnest account, either theoretically or practically, of the great interest of covenant, educational religion; that they have no proper faith in the idea of sacramental grace which lies at the foundation of it; and that their tendency, at least, is always toward that opposite scheme, by which all religion resolves itself,

at last, into a system of private opinions and purely individual feelings. It is historically certain, that the unliturgical usage in all churches in which it has prevailed since the time of the Reformation, has been attended with a progressive movement, more or less decided, in this bad direction. No thoughtful mind turned toward the subject can well help seeing and feeling that there is in some way an ominous affinity between free worship and free thinking in religion, both in its fanatical and its rationalistic polar extremes. Cold Unitarianism and blazing Methodism, or say the inward light of Quakerism in George Fox, and the inward light of the same Quakerism in Elias Hicks, alike opposed in their genius to fixed devotional forms, show a common opposition also to the whole conception of a true churchly Christianity; and along with this, as a matter of course, a common indifference to the whole idea of a true Christian nurture in the Lord.*

One may see the importance of public liturgical worship by considering how, in its absence, even the primary and most necessary forms of religious confession and devotion are apt to fall into disuse, and to become thus in the end as strange almost to the family and the school as they are to the church. It is not too much to say, that the Lord's Prayer itself, in such circumstances, can never be held in proper honor and use. Where the unliturgical spirit prevails, it seems to have no proper home even in the Christian sanctuary. We have whole religious denominations among whom its voice is scarcely ever heard in pulpit devotion. And what shall we say of the creed, the Apostles' Creed, the old, glorious oriflamb of Christ's sacramental host from the beginning? Where, among unliturgical churches, do we find it lifted up as a standard, from Sabbath to Sabbath, in the name of the Lord? In such churches the Creed is never brought into use at all as a part of worship. Its introduction in this way would be regarded generally, indeed, as an exceptional singularity, a novelty not to be admired or approved. Thus practically disowned in the sanctuary, the devotional symbol finds no home either in the family. It is a most significant fact, well worthy to be noted and laid to heart. Unliturgical denominations are without the creed, as an educational form of faith and piety. It is not recited in their

*These are sweeping extravagant assertions not sustained by facts. Some churches without such Liturgies have shown more educational power than some others which make great account of them.

households, nor taught to their children. For the most part, indeed, the power even of repeating it is lost. With the great body of the people it is gone out of memory and out of knowledge. Let this be taken as of itself an overwhelming example to show how poorly qualified all such denominations are to care properly for what we have seen to be the true idea of educational religion.

Here, then, altogether is a most grave defect, which might well be urged against the system of extemporaneous prayer, as a full offset at least to its claim of superior life and spirituality, even if this were allowed to be valid. But the claim itself is disputed. There may be, indeed, more semblance of life where the mind is thus put upon the task of producing both the matter and form of prayer on the spur of the moment; but it is a mistake to assume at once that this proceeds from the true spirit of devotion. To a large extent, it must be referred to the mere mental working that is engaged in the exercise, which is no index or measure whatever of the working of the heart. It would seem to be plain rather that the immediate, natural effect of such a strain upon thought, must be a diversion of vital energy from the function of feeling. The two processes are entirely different. The activity of invention is one thing, the activity of devotion is another thing altogether. In this view it is not unreasonable to say, that prepared, long familiar forms, offer on the whole a better solicitation and a more favorable outlet for the spirit of devotion, than any possible utterances extemporized for the purpose. Where the devotional mind is wanting, they become, of course, forms only, and nothing more; like the wheels in Ezekiel's vision, that had no proper motion except by the power of the living spirit that was in them. But where the devotional mind is wanting, extemporaneous prayer is itself only another phase of formality, more offensive, we may say, than that of the prayer-book; even as the spasmodic workings of a galvanized corpse are more unsightly and hideous than the features of the same corpse in a state of repose. Better at any time for a worshipping congregation, if to such mournful masking it must come, the mummery of ritualistic forms, in themselves decent and well composed, than the mummery of prayers that mouth the heavens without either form or life. But this is not the alternative on which to base any proper comparison of the two systems of worship. Let the devotional spirit, the inward fitness for worship, be at hand. Then, we say, it will flow into easy

vigorous exercise by the use of liturgical forms—the wonted and well-worn channels of previous devotional thought—much more readily, as a general thing, than by the aid of any extemporaneous inspirations whatever.*

(To be continued.)

IMMANUEL.

THIS is one of the many significant titles applied to our Redeemer. No single title would be sufficient to tell what He is in Himself, and what He is to us, and has done for us. Indeed, the whole of them fail to declare all that He is.

How could earthly words of human thought and speech fully express divine and heavenly things? Man's words, like himself, are finite. Divine realities are infinite. If man's hand cannot span the heavens, how can man's thoughts or words span and comprehend Him, or the fullness of grace and truth of Him of whose glory the heavens are but a faint reflection?

Nevertheless, the words used to declare to men what God is, do so most truly, and as far as it is possible for us, in our present state, to know Him; and, also, as far as it is needful for us to know Him. There is no deception in those words. They mean all they say, and more than human words can express. Only that *more* must always be in entire harmony with the true meaning of the words themselves.

So of the title *Immanuel*. Its literal meaning is: *God with us*. It is used to tell us that *Jesus* is Jesus; that is, Saviour, as God with us. Hence, this name reveals a blessed fact and truth in regard to Him, well worthy of our most careful and devout consideration.

It is true this title is applied in the Bible but twice to our Redeemer—once in Isaiah (7: 14), and then in Matthew (1: 23). In Matthew it is quoted from Isaiah, chiefly to show that the pro-

* Thus far, even, it is plain enough what the committee intended. The worst case possible is made against free prayer, and what we may call a free liturgy, such as our church has from the first recognized as sufficient. This is done to pave the way for presenting, in the most favorable light, the pet theory of the committee in regard to worship. We shall see, as the report proceeds, how skillfully but deceptively and unfairly this is done.

phesy and hope of the Old Testament were fulfilled and realized in Jesus.

Undoubtedly, there are good reasons why this name is applied to our Redeemer but twice, whilst those other titles, Jesus, Christ, Lord, are so often used. The two principal reasons for this are plainly indicated in the Scriptures. They are, first, because these other titles set forth His special character or person and work, as God manifest in the flesh; and, secondly, because we are most concerned to know Him as Jesus Christ our Lord. He is Immanuel, that He may be Jesus. He needed to be Immanuel, that He might be Jesus. We can rightly know, believe in, and love Him as Immanuel only when we have learned to know Him, and have been led to believe in Him, under a sense of our deep need of Him, as Jesus Christ our Lord.

But although this particular name is used but twice in the Holy Scriptures, the fact or truth which it expresses, "God with us," is often stated and taught, and may be found in many places. The people of God, under the Old Testament dispensation, were familiar with it, in the sense peculiar to that dispensation. They knew God not only as Jehovah, whose throne was in the highest heavens, and who, as king of kings, ruled over all things in majesty and might. They knew Him not only as being present with His people in a general way, by His own presence, or in some more special way by His particular providence. Beyond this, and as still more comforting than this, they knew Him as sustaining a far closer relationship to them by His *abiding personal nearness to them, and presence in their midst.*

To their fathers—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—God had granted occasional manifestations of such nearness. But unto Israel, in the journey through the desert, the Lord gave an assurance and proof of His constant presence in the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night; and even more impressively in the abode of the Shekinah over the mercy-seat in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple. This fact of God's presence among them is often mentioned, and is gloried in as the highest privilege and chief joy of His people. "The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge. "God is in the midst of Zion. therefore she shall not be moved." "In all their afflictions He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence went with them." "There will I commune with them from between the mercy-seat." "What

nation is there so great, that hath God with them, as the Lord is with us in all things that we call upon Him for."

How they thought of Him as thus present with them, and believed in His presence, may be easily learned from what is said on the subject in many passages in the Old Testament. One thing is certain, that every pious and truly enlightened Israelite always remembered that however near God might draw to them, and however constantly He might dwell among them, He was ever near and present as *God*, infinitely exalted above them in His being and attributes. Another fact is equally clear, and worthy to be noted. It is, that no true Israelite, holding to the pure faith of the patriarchs and the prophets, ever thought of God as in any way mixed up in His nature or essence with the visible or material symbols of His presence. Their faith kept His being infinitely and sacredly distinct from the substance of the signs or tokens He might use to manifest the reality of His presence.

It is also pleasant and instructive to note another fact in this connection. God was known under the old covenant as dwelling with His people, not only in the associate or organized capacity, but as *single persons* or *individuals*, also. He was, therefore, not merely with the nation or the *church*, as a whole, and by means of some formal public ordinances, but also willing to assure the heart of each member of the nation or church of his indwelling Spirit and sustaining grace. This is taught in those precious words of Isaiah (57: 15): "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy. I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones."

O, how much more comforting must this doctrine have been for "an Israelite indeed," than the vain and superstitious notions of those heathen who held that their gods were with them and in them, by being a part of their very substance and life! For there were heathen in those days who taught and believed that men were *emanations* from the substance and being of God, and who, therefore, regarded themselves as having theanthropic (that is, god-man) *natures*, by reason of some mysterious organic connection with the God-head, as they conceived it.

All these Old Testament views of God as *Immanuel*, were, however, only partial intimations and foreshadowings of what should

be fully realized under the dispensation of the new covenant of grace. They must have been unspeakably comforting, as far as they went, and served to prepare the mind and heart for still better things to come. Those better things were realized in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. In Him, emphatically in the highest sense, and in a sense altogether peculiar to Him, we have "God with us," as "the Word become flesh," to dwell among us. He is "God with us," not as God was in the "burning bush" to Moses, nor as God was in the Shekinah, nor only as God dwelt by His Spirit with the spirit of the contrite and the humble Israelite of old. In Jesus we have God actually abiding in a human body—the nature of God the Son in real union with a nature like our own, and miraculously prepared out of the substance of human nature; that is, "the seed of the woman." In Him, therefore, we see "God in human flesh appear;" the fullness of the God-head bodily. God in Christ is the closest approach of God to man of which it is possible to conceive, and the most intimate form in which it is possible to think of God as being with men. Taking the words in their right sense, He became "flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone," just as, taken in a proper sense, we are said to be made through faith, "members of His flesh, His body and His bones."

It would be a very great and grave error, however, to think and hold that the human nature in which the Word became flesh, was an emanation from the substance of the nature of God. The Bible expressly teaches the contrary, and declares that the human nature of our Lord Jesus Christ was "prepared" by the almighty power of God, in the nature of the Virgin Mary.

So, again, it would be wholly contrary to the Scriptures to think that Jesus Christ is Immanuel, in the sense that His divine nature entered into such a union with the human nature He assumed, that the two natures were fused into one, so making a *God-man nature*. To think or hold this, would not only be against what the Bible teaches concerning Christ, as God manifest in the flesh, but still more against what it teaches concerning the infinite and eternal nature of God Himself.

Such views of Immanuel are not to be rejected only because they are wrong, unscriptural in themselves, but because they involve other serious errors relating to the work of redemption. They start in false views of Christ, lead to false views of grace,

and are likely to end in an utter perversion of the Gospel way of salvation.

Why Jesus was Immanuel in the Gospel sense, is likewise clearly declared to us. It was, namely, that *He might be Jesus for us*; that He might be able in His human nature to bear the penalty of our sins, "suffer the just for the unjust, to bring *us* to God," and so, in that nature, be "the Lamb of God to take away the sins of the world."

According to the Scriptures, therefore, the incarnation *was* in order to redemption; it *was* a means to an end; God *did* come and dwell with us, in this form and manner, because in infinite condescending love and mercy He, the Lord and Master, was willing to "serve for our sins," and "give Himself a ransom for many."

These are precious old Gospel truths, of which we must allow no false philosophy (vainly so called) to rob us. They have often been objected as shallow, mechanical and unphilosophical. We need not care for that. Waters are not always shallow because so clear that the bed of the stream may be easily seen. Lake George, in New York State, is said to be four hundred feet deep at some places, and yet pebbles can be easily discerned on the bottom, whilst the muddy waters of a pool through which a dwarf might wade may seem profoundly deep.

If our Gospel faith is to yield to every puff of error which false teachers may seek to circulate, we should be kept busy, indeed, in shifting our sails to the veering winds.

But it is not enough to know that Jesus is Immanuel; that is, God with us. We need personally to make sure of our own immediate saving interest in this wonderful and blessed truth. He became *Immanuel-Jesus* for the world, that each poor lost sinner might find Him such for himself.

Are we, then, "in Him and He in us," in the sense of our being united to Him by faith, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and of our being *reconciled* unto God by His "*peace-speaking blood*?" Have we learned to know Him, by the blessed assurance of enlightened faith, as our Immanuel? Let each one ponder this question earnestly, as a question of life, and not rest until He has found Him, and receive Him whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets foretold as the great and only *Immanuel-Jesus*, "God with us," to save His people from their sins.

“WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?”—ISAIAH 21: 11.

THE night in our Reformed church has been long, but the day seems to be dawning. True, we must for awhile yet “earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.” Jude 3. We must have some patience yet. But the final issue is hardly any longer uncertain.

How does it stand to-day with our Zion in regard to the new Ritualistic movement, that had crept in unawares until it had grown to such proportions that it claimed already to be *the Reformed church*—claimed to speak its voice, to represent its doctrines, to exercise its authority, and willing to tolerate only for a brief period that which opposed it? Watchman, what of the night? What are its signs of promise?

Seven years ago (1866), when the second General Synod met in Dayton, Ohio, matters looked indeed gloomy and foreboding for the future Reformed church. The Revised Liturgy had just been brought out. The earlier opposition of Drs. Berg, Heiner and Zacharias, had been completely crushed out. The new views had been so widely diffused among the younger members of the ministry, and the older ones were so timid in respect to publicly coming out for the old historical faith, that the New-order men came to that Synod with the highest hopes of getting the new doctrines fully endorsed, and of obtaining the adoption of the new ritual in the church. Indeed, it was repeatedly and openly claimed, that the venerable Eastern Synod had fully and formally endorsed the same, and that it was now the full wish of the church, as spoken by her highest judicatory, that the people should regard the same as the actual faith and order of the Reformed church in the United States.

“Why oppose this thing?” we were told; “you only oppose the work of the Holy Spirit. You only place yourselves in the way of a powerful and resistless movement that is pervading all the denominations. It will be a great credit if we in the Reformed church take the van of Protestantism. What will you do? we have all the institutions, colleges, seminaries, church papers, on our side? Would it not be better to submit at once? You will have to submit in the end, at any rate.”

But resistance was made, and has been steadily maintained until

the present day, and will probably be continued until the Mercersburg heresy is fully overcome.

What of the night? Has there been any fruit to this controversy of seven years?

Certainly there has, as is openly acknowledged on all sides. That man must be blind, indeed, who cannot see that a great deal *has been gained* in this time, and that a very effectual stop has been put to the power and spread of Mercersburgism.

1. The boast that all the colleges, seminaries and papers of the church are in favor of Mercersburg, although almost true then, is no longer true. More than half of them are now opposed to Mercersburg, as such, and in full sympathy with the old historical faith.

2. The Mercersburg doctrines and the liturgical practices of that school, have never received the sanction of the highest judicatories of the church; and it is confessed by all intelligent observers that there is now no probability that they will ever be so endorsed. The new-order of worship, if submitted to the Classes, could not obtain the vote of a majority of the Classes; it is very doubtful whether one-third of them would vote in favor of its adoption. We are ready, and willing, and anxious to see the trial made.

3. The Revised Liturgy has never been submitted to a vote of adoption or rejection by the General Synod, or by the Classes. It is well known that its friends are afraid so to submit it. They acknowledge that if so submitted it would be voted down, not only by the Classes, but also by the congregations. No argument or entreaty can induce them to agree to such a reference.

4. The last General Synod was decidedly opposed to the whole Mercersburg movement. It repeatedly voted so as to express its disapprobation. If God continues to favor us, we doubt not all succeeding General Synods will continue in the same way to use their influence, if not their authority, against these novelties.

5. In various portions of the church *the people* (individually and by congregations), are manifesting their dissatisfaction with the whole movement. Just in proportion as it becomes clearly understood, in its spirit and aims, are the good people at outs with it; and they manifest this in a variety of ways.

6. Quite a number of the leading Mercersburg ministers and members have brought to light the character and tendency of the

whole system, by passing openly over to Rome (just as it was predicted at Dayton that they would). It is worthy of special note, that one of the Mercersburg men, writing in the *Messenger*, states openly that *Forney* passed over to Rome because he foresaw that the *ritualistic movement could not triumph* in the Reformed church. He foresaw its complete downfall, and therefore forsook the ship. This is quite creditable to his sagacity and intelligence. We regard this judgment as quite correct. We think there is now not the remotest prospect that the Revised Liturgy can ever be adopted in the Reformed church. There is much less prospect of this now than there was six years ago, or even three years ago. Its case is practically *hopeless*. It is acknowledged now that, even apart from doctrinal and ritualistic errors, it is not even a successful book *after its own order and kind*. In practice it is found to be "heavy, tedious and unedifying." But no revision even will save it. The men, papers and institutions, who were once so influential in such matters, have to a great extent lost their influence, and they feel it very sensibly. They differ greatly among themselves, quietly drop some of their new views, modify and explain away others, seek to give them such a turn as will make them apparently consistent with the Heidelberg Catechism. They no longer seek to lord it over the whole American church, and denounce all outside of their circle as Puritans, Rationalists, pseudo-Protestants. They now find themselves quite fully occupied in explaining away and defending their own errors. To a considerable extent the false feathers with which they had decked themselves, have been brushed away; and it is seen on all hands that they have no such amount of general theological knowledge and insight as was formerly supposed and assumed. They claimed that the Mercersburg movement was identical with modern evangelical theology; but, unfortunately, it has turned out that this is not so, and that in truth they had no real acquaintance with that theology. They did not know what it was. It has become plain that much of their boasted system consists of *dissecta membra* of various and irreconcilable systems, rendering it impossible for them to remain consistent with themselves or their principles.

We believe, too, that it is true that, while a considerable number of their best men have gone over to Rome, others are quietly withdrawing their confidence, and becoming more and more

decided in favor of the old Reformed faith, in opposition to all philosophy, falsely so called.

Let us take heart, then, and stand together a little while longer.

J. H. G.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND LANCASTER.

A CHARACTERISTIC article appeared some weeks ago, written probably by Dr. T. G. Apple, in which the Evangelical Alliance is described as it appears from Lancaster, when looked at through the glasses they use at that place when observing anything that relates to the Evangelical Protestantism of the world, and especially all that pertains to the Evangelical Alliance. It appears in the department of Theology and Criticism, and does duty, no doubt, in the *critical* part of that remarkable department. As to its authorship, it is to be found among the Professors at Lancaster, and *may* be from the pen or heart of him who once before assailed the Alliance. It is a sad proof of how *small great* men can sometimes make themselves, while they are unconscious of their labor. It is pervaded by the spirit of spite and disappointment, under the guise of candor and honorable criticism, but is really impelled by feelings such as those of a spoiled maiden who has been overlooked in the invitations to the last party, or of some aspiring politician whose prëminent qualifications were ignored in the late nominations of his party. The writings indicate soreness, and yet the evident soreness is attempted to be hidden. While tens of thousands all over the Christian world are rejoicing in the assembling and utterances of this great Protestant and Christian Alliance, there are those who deem it their unlovely vocation to criticise, find fault and misrepresent it. Among these is the writer in question, who appears to echo and defend the words and cherish the feelings of some one who is allowed to give them vent in *Lippincott's Magazine*, who said of the Alliance and its late meeting in New York, "It was really a vast movement of the Presbyterian church. Geneva and Calvin were the exclusive proprietors. Episcopalians, Unitarians and Baptists, Methodists and Universalists, were requested to stand aside." The Lancaster writer has, perhaps, not the same sympathy with Unitarians

and Universalists that the magazine correspondent has ; but, then, while he is the champion of churchliness and sacerdotalism, they unite in their antipathy for Presbyterianism. And while this is put forth, occasion is taken to assault Dr. Schaff who, it is more than insinuated, gave the Alliance its Presbyterian character. Another grave charge is, that Lutheranism—the *conservative or Fritschel* Lutheranism—was not accounted of as it should be, and that Dr. Krauth, having read his essay, sat apart and gloomy, taking no part further in the proceedings. This may be so. We were not there to see. Yet it may not have been for any fault in the Alliance. It is very possible that both Dr. Krauth and Dr. Nevin did not feel themselves in a congenial atmosphere. It was too evangelically warm and pure for them. Their cheerless philosophy and *objective* religion may have so disposed them. It is very evident that even Lancaster feels that Dr. Nevin's essay created no enthusiasm in that soul-inspiring council. Even for this the Alliance may not have been to blame. Perhaps that essay was so profound that the provincial minds of his audience could not grasp it? We hope that Lancaster philosophy will console Dr. Nevin's votaries, and that Dr. Krauth may find a more congenial body some day. We have not seen his "philosophical" essay, as it did not appear in our *New York Tribune*, nor do we know whether its excellencies were appreciated by that "one-sided body." Dr. Conrad, of the Lutheran church, also, who was in the Alliance, and whose essay, a very interesting one, on a practical subject, was well received, does not seem to have got on his "high-horse," nor sat apart as one of Homer's gloomy heroes, but rejoices in the Alliance, and felt not that he was "ruled or swallowed up" by the Presbyterians and Calvinists, or even the Puritans. But, then Dr. Conrad did not have a philosophical essay, and does not belong to the ritualistic wing of Lutheranism, and is not in such favor at Lancaster as Krauth and Fritschel. We are clearly of the opinion, that Lancaster should forgive the Alliance for not being enthusiastic over the essays of their friends—the mediocre minds of that little affair could not comprehend them.

But to return to the criticism as regards Presbyterian "preponderance" in the Alliance, we fail to see it unless it be numerical, which can be accounted for by the numerous branches of that faith in our own country, Scotland, Ireland and Canada.

As we said, we were not eye-witnesses. At our distance, reading the reports of the doings; reading the essays and speeches; trying to find the animus of the council, we are bound to say that we cannot see any attempt to put forward arrogantly the peculiarities of Presbyterianism. We can see no attempt to rule the assembly for denominational or sectarian ends. Nor were we aware that any attempt had been made to "swallow up" Dr. Schneck, Dr. Anderson—the Dean of Canterbury—Lord Churchill, Dr. Stoughton, Dr. Rigg, Prof. Dorner, Dr. Christlieb, Dr. Fisch, and Cohen Stuart, etc., etc. This were too daring an attempt for even those naughty followers of Calvin. Surely, those who were of the Alliance have not brought this charge, not even the Episcopalian, English or American, and it remains for *Lippincott* to speak of animosities, Bishop Tozer of violated canons, and *Lancaster* of failures. Lancaster finds fault that *Lutheranism* was not there to speak a *great Lutheran word*. (*Is this the voice of Dr. Apple?*) That is just what was *not* the object of the Alliance. It was not the time or place chosen to speak *Lutheran* or *Reformed words*, great or small, nor great Baptist or Presbyterian, Methodist, or any denominational *words*. Why, then, find fault? Conrad was there, Kelker was there, Dr. Tholuck was heard, and they only cared to speak a *great word* for Christ and Protestantism over against Rome, Puseyism, and Infidelity. The Alliance was not called, and all men knew the fact, to hear such words as might suit Lancaster; and if that is desirable, let Lancaster and those who sympathize with it, call their council and discuss "the differences of Protestantism;" or, if it is advisable, its *weakness* and "its failures," but do not blame the Alliance for that which it never was contemplated should be done by it.

Lancaster is also disgruntled because the Alliance did not set the churchly against the unchurchly side of Protestantism, and form a ring and fight it out. Any one might ask, what would be the benefit? A few churchly gladiators would be delighted to show their skill and their millenery, and that would be all except the resultant animosities. But why find fault with the Alliance for failing to get this show for the delight of a few that could take interest in it? How much would it do to unite the church of the living God in the work of the world's salvation? If this must be done, then let Lancaster and its confederate churchly high-churchmen prepare for the tournament, and if they can find any

one who has nothing better to do than waste his time in a bout with them, than go at it and have it out. It would do just the same amount of good that a convention of "the Woman's Rights" advocates and their opposers would accomplish, and no more.

Lancaster yet finds fault that the Alliance was not made an arena where Romanism and Protestantism should be made to assert their claims over against each other. All well, at the proper time and place; but it is an unjust and improper criticism of the Alliance to find fault for this, when it was no part of its work undertaken. When this is done, the Christian church must know and understand it. It had been an imposition for the Alliance at New York to turn itself into a grand debate between the chosen champions of Rome and Protestantism. This has been done on a small scale; and if the results on a large scale are to be of the same kind, then were Christ's cause well delivered of any part in it. It is the option of Lancaster, or of those who affiliate with it, to summon the Christian world to such a Congress as this. Let some one be found with the untiring energy of Dr. Schaff, to make it a success. But if, on the one hand, Rome's most bland and subtle sons appear, and, on the other, Lancaster and extreme Lutheranism and high-church Episcopacy, *what would there be to discuss?* Should, however, some erratic Puritans or Rome-hating German Presbyterians enter the lists against the errors and pretensions of the man of sin, what would Lancaster do? Where would Drs. Nevin, Gerhart, Apple, Higbee, Gans, etc., etc., take sides? Let Wagner, Wolff, Ermentrout, etc., the *Mercersburg Review* and the columns of the *Messenger*, answer. We fear that the Protestantism of the Eightieth Question of our Catechism would be surrendered without a tilt of spears.

It may subject us to the suspicion that we are a Yankee, but, nevertheless, we are curious to know whether the Rev. Profs. Dorner and Christlieb were pressing invited to visit Lancaster; whether its hospitalities were warmly tendered them; whether Krummacher or Kraft were cordially bidden to become guests of our professors and doctors; or, if they were, why they did not accept the invitations? They were honored at Princeton—some, if not all of them. We are also curious to see a critique on the essays of Drs. Dorner and Christlieb, from the pens of our Lancaster philosophers and *Protestants*. Can we have it? May we not hope to see it in the department of "*Criticism?*" It would

The Divided House; or, The Two Tendencies. 77

be fully as interesting, no doubt, as the criticism of the *defects* and *failure* of the Alliance. Why is it that Lancaster always finds fault with all that is done in the Protestant church? Who knows?

We were sorry to see the article against the Alliance from Lancaster. First, because it makes common cause with Infidelity, Romanism, Ritualism, and Bishop Tozer. Second, because it blames the Alliance for not doing what it was not formed to do, and which, if attempted, would have injured it and gratified its enemies. Third, because it is unmanly and uncandid. It evidences a spirit so selfish, that it causes one to blush for the dignity of humanity. Lastly, because it had been better quietly to prepare to carry out what they insist should be done, and thus earn an honor of their own kind and for their own work.

CALVIN.

THE DIVIDED HOUSE; OR, THE TWO TENDENCIES.

(*Continued.*)

It may seem a mark of perverse infatuation that a church should give loose reins to two rival tendencies to propagate themselves to their maturity in her own bosom. Yet, at Philadelphia it was done, and from that day the two antagonistic tendencies were authorized to do their utmost in carrying out their views.

It should not be complained at Cincinnati that its fruits are ready for harvesting, for that which a man soweth shall he also reap. Not only was this act suicidal, but had it been by any other church, or another majority, these Mercersburg men would probably have declared it an evidence of the absence of the Holy Ghost from its councils. The *Reformed church*, as such, is not responsible for this deed, and must not be held responsible for the fact that rival tendencies were let loose on her soil, there to contend for supremacy over or division of her territory. It was clearly an unconstitutional act to authorize the two tendencies, as represented by the two Liturgies, the freedom of use in the churches. When the general Synod at Dayton, under this same ritualistic majority, said that the Liturgy was "allowed as an order of worship proper to be used in the congregations and the

families of the Reformed church," it was a palpable evasion of Article 80 of the Constitution, and an infraction upon the rights of the Classes. And yet Dr. Fisher, an avowedly zealous guardian of the Constitution, was there when this was done. One might have thought that "he *was* talking, or he was pursuing, or he was on a journey, or peradventure, he was sleeping." For all the consequences growing out of the *free* use of both liturgies and their untrammelled permission to work strife, bitterness and division, *the church is not responsible*. Her power to forbid was fettered, and the controlling majority at Dayton and Philadelphia must be held responsible by the church and by God for the mischief done. We shall not now attempt to trace these two tendencies thus let loose in the church to their origin. It suffices to say, that they grew out of the unreformed theory of doctrine, called Mercersburg theology, and the antagonism which this new doctrine awakened in the church. These are embodied in the two rival Liturgies. One adheres to the doctrines as formally set forth by the Reformers, and adheres to the order of worship, in the main then adopted; the other is instinct with the unreformed doctrine of Mercersburg, and its usages and mode of worship is made to conform, in a large degree, to the *ante*-Reformation pattern, and is declared to be not after the manner and belief of the Reformed church at any period. "It is not the pattern according to which our fathers worshiped in these United States or elsewhere." Around these Liturgies the two tendencies gather up their force and make the two parts of this divided family. Let us now recapitulate. *a.* The records show that the Reformed church is divided in sentiment as touching worship and fundamental points of doctrine. This difference is so wide that the two tendencies cannot unite in the practical work of the church—not even in home missions. They use differing Liturgies. They have separate colleges and seminaries. They are educating each its own ministry. It is dividing congregations. This, surely, is a divided house.

b. These tendencies, so irreconcilable, were recognized by the General Synod at Philadelphia, and were authorized to work themselves freely without being trammelled in any direction. Thus were they allowed to develop themselves according to the germ they contained. If that germ was Puritanism, Rationalism, or Infidelity, as was declared of our tendency, then Synod said: work out the result, we will allow no consistory or congregation to

hinder you. If, on the other hand, the germ of superstition and Romish idolatry was in the other tendency, as was earnestly alleged, why, the Synod said to it, you are free ; if your tendency is to Ritualism and Rome, why, then, go there, and no congregation or consistory must forbid you.

c. The church has never authorized this ; never set these tendencies free to wage a war in her bosom and fight their way to their results. The Synods at Dayton and Philadelphia assumed the authority to do this ; refused to permit the church in its proper courts (the Classes) to determine the matter, but in the face of the Constitution rashly set in motion the forces that now divide the church.

d. Both the Synods at Dayton and Philadelphia were controlled by a majority that was led by Dr. Nevin, and "the rest of us" who adhere to the use of the new-order of worship, and glory in the Mercersburg theology. This accidental majority, by usurping the power of the Classes and violating the spirit of the Constitution, have wrought the terrible harm to the church complained of at Cincinnati.

e. The fact of the diversity of sentiment was recognized by both the Synods at Dayton and Philadelphia, and yet the majority refused to allow the question to go to the Classes to decide between them, and to ascertain the mind of the church on the question.

That the adherents of Dr. Nevin and the unreformed Liturgy are a faction and do not represent the mind of the church, we also believe. Their persistent refusal to allow the consistories and congregations a veto on the use of the Liturgy, and on the doctrines and forms of worship there set forth, show this. Had they felt sure of a majority of the consistory and congregation, this refusal would not be on the records of the church courts.

f. How, then, were these accidental majorities achieved ?

1. Because some were deceived by the pretenses that were set up for pure Reformed doctrine and usage. Some were made to believe that the opposition grew out of petty rivalries, etc. Some wanted peace at any price. Some went for the novelty of the thing.

2. Some believed that to oppose the professors was to oppose the church ; and others were made to believe that it was sinful to oppose the ministers—the church. The church, to all interests

and purposes, is divided. Shall there be a separation? This is the question. Of course, those who hold to the *old* paths will never consent to this. They have refused to follow any tendency but that which led them home or kept them in closest adherence to the doctrines and usages of the fathers. They do not believe that many will in the day of trial be found ready to enlist under the banner of Mercersburg and Dr. Nevin, even though all "the rest of us" go with him. That tendency has worked itself out; it used, "*in a free way*," the liberty given, and has in its vanguard reached Rome. It was not trammelled in that direction, and, true to its germ, it tended to the Vatican. What church court dare to censure them? Synod said they were free to work out the results, and this is *all* that has been done. Stewart, T. W. Philips, Wolff, Ermentrout, Wagner and Forney have just done what their friends at the Philadelphia Synod told them they were free to do—they followed the tendency of Nevinism, as embodied in the order of worship, to its logical results, and no doubt are surprised how easy it was to get to Rome.

It is also out of all character for the Ritualistic majority that ruled the General Synods of 1866 and 1869 to make such unseemly ado about the fact that theology, Reformed theology, as taught in the Heidelberg Catechism, and the growth of the doctrine of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, is taught at Ursinus. Was it not permitted that side of the question also to work out its results in "*a free way*." If it was needful, and its friends did think it was, to have theology taught in the Eastern Synod to do this, then it was not right to put trammels in this matter in the direction of Ursinus alone. Remember, no restriction was put on the two tendencies by the Synod; and surely if one was free to work out its results to Romanism, ought not the other be allowed to draw those who yielded to its power, nearer to the ancient Reformed landmarks. Should not Dr. Apple, Gerhart, etc., be more manly than to take back what they conceded in order that they in *a free way* might work out the results of their theological experiments at Lancaster?

Those who voted against this unrestricted liberty—who asked that power to limit this free way of reaching results—who proposed that a negative should be placed in the consistory and in the congregation, do now claim the *right* to use all proper means, and employ all proper agencies to work out the results of Reformed

theology and bind the hearts of the church to the faith once delivered to the saints. These, too, while they repudiate and abhor the errors of Mercersburg and denounce the Romanism of the Eastern Liturgy, expect to remain in the old house their fathers built. If others will separate they may, but it will be found that when men divided the Reformed church, they were mistaken in believing that its members would go with them. They have enough of the *free way*, and now say with Mon. Pernessen, of the Reformed National Synod of France, "We are willing you should launch a *new ship*, provided you are not our pilots, and we are not constrained to be your passengers."

ULRIC.

MORE EVASIONS.

OUR Lancaster friends seem bent on evading the points pressed upon them. This may be annoying to some persons, and tempt them to say: Why urge the matter further? You can't keep them to the mark. They have been fairly convicted by their own words, and only prove by their replies a determination to deceive themselves or others. There is no use in arguing with men who resort to such evasions, &c.

We take a different view of the case. Their evasions are, in one sense, annoying, we admit. But, knowing by long experience with whom we have to deal, they are, in another respect, encouraging. They prove that the parties are conscious of being in a dilemma. Men will not evade evidence which they can squarely rebut. All attempts to do so plainly shows that they feel the weakness of their cause, and yet are unwilling frankly to confess it.

The fact appears to be, that the Lancaster Faculty is holding and teaching notions which are seen to be in direct conflict with evangelical theology, especially with the Reformed faith, and yet they fear to acknowledge it, and try to hold up those notions as sound and right.

Instead, therefore, of abandoning the case, it will be better to pursue it a little further. Lancaster must be constrained to explain and defend itself, or yield the point and fairly accept the consequences. It may do them good to be forced to see how far

they have erred from the faith. It certainly will do others good to be convinced of it. And, what is of still more account, it will help to save the church from being carried away by deceptive and pernicious errors.

Our December article—*What is It!*—was a plain setting forth of the Lancaster errors, by quotations fairly made from the writings of that school. Every candid reader could see the purport and the bearing of those quotations.* They were given without comment, so as to let them tell their own story.

There was a frank, fair way of meeting the argument of those quotations. Dr. Apple, or some one else of the Faculty, should have taken them up, one by one, or all together as a whole (and we meant them to be taken together), and have shown that they did not and could not, in any true sense, mean and teach the

* For the benefit of new subscribers we give the quotations again :

"Religion, to be real, must be in some way *community of life with God*; * * * an "*inward conjunction in a real way.*"

"Christ *united Himself with manhood in its deepest substance, organically*, as its head, so that it may be saved generically in Him." The incarnation was "a union (of the Godhead in its substance, B.) with humanity, as an organic whole."

Again, the incarnation is declared to be "the incorporation of this higher element (that is, the substance of the Godhead in Christ, B.) into the actual onflowing life-stream of the world; * * * a movement on the part of God in the bosom of humanity, taking hold on the depths of our human (Cosmic) existence in the most real historical way."

"Christianity is a *new order of life*, which is comprehended primarily in the person of Christ, and *which starts forth from Him as its original principle and root.*"

"The word incarnate is the root and origin of the entire new creation, no less fully than He is to be considered as being, before He became man, the producing cause of the old creation."

"The *organic* view of Christianity underlies the true idea of the church."

"The ultimate reason for the incarnation is to be sought * * * *in the necessity of the divine self-revelation ad intra*, and in the relation of the second person of the Trinity *ad extra*, to all that He created and made."

"The two creations (that is, the one described in Gen. 1, and the creation described in the new creation in Jesus Christ under the Gospel, B.) are exhibited as being throughout *organically joined together* in His person."

"Neither is there any room for doubt in regard to the law which should govern the *coalescence* of the two orders of existence into one. * * There must be for this purpose a flowing into it (that is, into the lower natural life of man, B.) of spirit and life from a higher sphere (in an organic way, B.) Only in and by the powers of the heavenly world itself—only *through real conjunction* with those powers proceeding forth, as they do, from the Lord of life and glory—is it possible to *conceive rationally* of the glorification of the natural in man by means of the spiritual. The case requires and involves thus in the end an *actual coming together of nature and the supernatural, of the human and the divine*, to make the idea of humanity and the world complete."

"That life-breath which God breathed forth into Adam when he became a living soul, *cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God.*"

"The life of regeneration is an *emanation, by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's divine-human life.*"

"The *life of the parent is transmitted* by ordinary generation to the child, and transmitted without any diminution of life on the side of the parent. * * *Life begets life.* * * Now, in this way we have an analogy in the natural order of what takes place in the glorified order."

errors charged upon their theology. He might then have stated explicitly what they did mean, and have demonstrated, if that could be done, that the theology of his school, though expressing itself in such peculiar ways, meant nothing contrary to or essentially differing from the faith of the church on the points involved.

Instead of doing this, however, he adopts an entirely different course. The quotations are allowed to be fair and correct, and there is no positive denial of the sense in which we, and many others (including Dr. Dorner), have taken them or similar utterances of the school. But it is impliedly, at least, denied that they teach the errors with which they are charged. Then Dr. Apple turns about and tries another way of getting out of the unpleasant predicament.

Catechising.

He assumes an offensive posture, and puts a number of questions to us, demanding our views in regard to the matters involved. He calls upon us to say, since we object to the doctrines taught by Lancaster, what *we* hold in reference to those doctrines. As we find fault with their way of expressing themselves, he insists upon our putting the thing our way, &c.

All right. We have not the least objection to being questioned. The catechetical method is an excellent one. We are entirely willing to take the bench, and let the Lancaster Faculty catechise us, fairly, as long and as sharply as they please. Let it be done, however, at the right time. Just now Lancaster is on the bench. They have put themselves there by their efforts to introduce into the church a theology believed to be seriously at variance with the faith of the church. When they are through, it may come to our turn, and we shall no way shrink from it.

Why this?

But why does Dr. Apple resort to this way of meeting our article? Plainly because he was unwilling to meet it squarely, and unable to defend his theology against the convicting evidence of our quotations. Every impartial reader of his reply must have felt this. That attempted reply amounts to nothing better than to an evasion from first to last.

Does the writer deny this? Then let him allow us to imitate his catechising example, and by a few plain, direct questions,

afford him another opportunity of doing what he needs to do in defence of his school, but forgot to do in his reply.

Define your Position.

The Lancaster school has long and often claimed to be occupying a wholly peculiar theological position, especially in regard to the fundamental doctrines of the incarnation, redemption, etc. Its leading advocates have in turn assailed every form of Evangelical Protestantism, including that of the Reformed church, and only excepting in part Puseyism and ultra-Lutheranism. It has called them successively, gnostically spiritualistic, rationalistic, materialistic, pietistic, and puritanic.

Now, we beg Dr. Apple, or some other member of that Faculty, to tell us in plain terms for once, where the theology of their school stands? Dorner, speaking for the modern evangelical theology of Germany says, in contradiction of Dr. Nevin's assertions, it is not with us. Dr. Hodge, speaking for the large Presbyterian branch of the Reformed church, says it is not with us. And every other branch of Evangelical Protestantism that has taken any notice at all of the Lancaster "duodeoimo" theology, has declared it is not with us.

All disclaim kindredship with it, excepting Rome, Puseyism, and ultra-Lutheranism, as represented by Prof. Fritschel, of Iowa.

Will not the Faculty please say candidly whether in their inmost consciousness and conscience, they do not think their theology more Puseyite and ultra-Lutheran, than anything else?

Explain Terms.

Another peculiarity of the Lancaster school is found in the very frequent use of *terms* and phrases which are either entirely new for our Reformed theology, or which seem to be used in an entirely novel sense. There is good reason, therefore, for asking for a clear and unambiguous explanation of those terms. To this request the Faculty should gladly respond. We mention a few such terms so that a fair opportunity for explanation may be given.

"*Organic Redemption and Christianity*;" "*union (of the Godhead in the Word) with humanity as an organic whole*;" the two creations "*organically joined together in His (Christ's) Person*." We know what *organic* means in its usual literal sense as applied to plants, animals and men. We know also what it means in a

topical or figurative sense, when applied to States, associations, laws, and systems of science or philosophy. But what does Lancaster theology mean by it when it uses it to express some relation assumed to exist between God, in Redemption or Christianity, and mankind? Does it not mean that as in the *literal* cases named above there are real *substantial* organs through which the life of such organized things is transmitted by seed of the same substance with the things themselves, so as to produce the same things in substance and kind; so in Redemption, in Christianity there are real, literal organs (however sublimated and refined they may be) through which the very substance of the life of God is made to pass over to mankind, so as to produce corresponding results?

If Lancaster should answer this question by quoting (as it has done) the passage, "partakers of the divine nature," then we beg the Faculty to explain whether it understands this Scripture phrase as teaching such a transfer or conveyance of the very substance of God in Christ over into the human nature of every believer?

And, further: when Lancaster says that the Incarnation of the Son was affected by such an "organic conjunction" of the divine nature with human nature as an organic whole—it does not mean that the two natures were so joined together as to form but one nature? Or if not this, will the Faculty please say how two natures can be organically fused and yet kept really distinct?

"*Emanation from the being of God;*" and "*emanation (in regeneration) by the Holy Ghost from Christ's divine-human life.*" Does not Lancaster mean, by the former of these expressions, to teach and say, that the substance of man's life *flowed* by the will of God from the substance of God's being or life; or, in other words, that man's soul or spirit is an offshoot, a substantial emanation from God's? And if this is not what is meant, what does the statement mean? By the other expression or statement, does not Lancaster mean, that in the sacrament of Baptism, some real germinal substance passes over, through the sacrament, as a channel to the person baptized, and that this germinal substance is really and literally a part of the very substance of what it calls the theanthropic nature of Christ?

Not to lay too heavy a burden on our friend at once, these inquiries may suffice for the present. They can readily appreciate

the importance, for their own sakes, as well as others, of giving them fair consideration, and unequivocal answers. The questions indicate our understanding of their theory. We believe we have not misunderstood it. But we are willing and anxious to afford our friends the fullest opportunity of explaining their views, and proving that they are not holding or teaching any sort of pantheism.

Should it not accord with their sense of dignity to pay any formal attention to our plain, straightforward inquiries, we shall cheerfully accept a valid explanation in their own way. Only our friends must not delude themselves with the thought that they can best vindicate their errors by contemptuous silence. Such silence will be fully and fairly understood as a confession of their inability to defend their cause.

Ursinus College Repertory.

THE pages of this department are again devoted mainly to addresses delivered at the recent anniversary of the "*Schaff Literary Society*." It affords us great pleasure to be able to furnish these addresses of our young men of the two societies, and it is gratifying to know that our readers are interested in their publication. As in the case of the addresses of the Zwinglian Society, which appeared in the *Monthly* soon after their delivery, those now published will be found to possess great merit and reflect honor upon Ursinus College. Our friends, we feel sure, will share the honest pride we take in these practical illustrations of the successful progress of the College.

By an oversight which we regret, the oration published in the January number, appeared without a prefatory statement of its character, or of the name of the author, Mr. *Leighton G. Kremer*, of Lebanon. The former of the two given below, is by Mr. *J. G. Neff*, of Kutztown, Pa., and the latter by Mr. *M. Peters*, of Saegerville, Pa.

THE UNITED STATES IN HISTORY.

By a careful research into the physical universe, we perceive harmony, order, and purpose pervading the whole. Design, like golden threads, runs through the whole organic world, vegetable and animal, and unites both to inorganic nature according to place and circumstances. The zöologist sees in the innumerable forms of animal life, but four "typical forms" which embrace the whole animal kingdom. The scientist arranges the whole vegetable world into regular classes, orders, genera, and species. To the uneducated, the heavens present a scene of disorder and confusion. But to Newton's eye all was order and harmony. All those glittering orbs had their appointed places and fixed orbits. Moreover, there is not an object, phenomenon, or law in nature, which does not subserve a specific purpose in the order and existence of the whole. Considerations of this kind lead us to the illation that there must be such order and purpose in the moral world which is incomparably above mere physical nature. And, furthermore, that there is not a phenomenon in history which does not act an essential part in the great historical scheme of the world.

The United States, in geographical extension equal to "Old Imperial Rome," in fertility of soil unsurpassed, the home of the thousands of all the different nationalities that are immigrating annually, must have some momentous part to perform in the history of the world, and a part which can be acted by no other nation. It is difficult for us to conceive of the future greatness of America, except so far as we are enabled from the uniformity of the law of history. Who ever dreamed of our present civilization and political power at the time when Columbus, a fanatic, a dreamer and an enthusiast, was imploring aid for that important discovery. The very lightning that illuminated the watery waste around his ship, scudding the deep; the very thunder that terrified his crew, was turned into a means, on the very soil upon which we now stand, of conveying thought all around the world in a moment of time. We are ready to give a reply to the inspired exclamation of Job, "Canst thou send lightning that they may go and say unto thee, here we are!" There seem to be no impossibilities in the way of a clear-minded, pure-hearted, energetic race.

Civilization moves with the course of the sun. "Time's noblest

offspring is the last." Before the United States had risen into historical importance, Asia and Europe successively formed the arena of the world's intellectual life. But civilization, which had its origin or source in the east, gradually enlarged in extension and depths in its geographical flow westward, until it reached the new world, admirably fitted to receive its entire stream; impure and defiled at first, its errors and superstitions crystallized and precipitated upon the old soil, and now it is permitted us to enjoy the bright sun of liberty and independence, and the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ, our guide-star and hope. These are the fruits, not of our own labors alone, but of the accumulated labors of all the past from the beginning of history. We need not undergo the painful process of seeking for the truth, which the by-gone ages have endured. We need not be groping in the dark, like the Greeks and Romans, for the great moral truths which pertain to the eternal destiny of the world. But all these truths have been handed down to us as our social, intellectual and moral inheritance. We receive civilization from the hands of our ancestors all ready-made, as the basis of further improvement. Moreover, the political experience and discipline of the past, as marked out to us in history, was requisite in order to the Constitution of the United States. In it we perceive, as in a picture, the governmental powers of the entire past. The President symbolizes monarchy, characteristic of the very infancy of the race. The representatives form the aristocratic element. That each naturalized citizen is permitted a voice, the democratic element. Here we have the three great types of government harmonized into one.

Humanity, in its march through the ages, is analogous to the stages of man's individual existence. It has spent its infancy in the east, under the iron arm of authority and power, where it has learned obedience and submission. It has attained its manhood in Europe, where it has become conscious of its own internal dignity and power, and of the need of individual and social emancipation for the full development of those powers. Nature points to America as the historical theatre of its last act. Liberty, civil and religious, is the medium of manhood.

Each nation has its ruling sentiment, or an underlying principle which shapes its character. Hence, we have the different nationalities. Amongst the Greeks this ruling sentiment was "love of

glory." Amongst the Romans, it was desire of power, and universal sway or dominion. Amongst the Americans it is *love of liberty*.

This underlying principle, which is the fruit of the struggling ages, approved of by reason, and matured under the rays of Divine revelation, urged our Pilgrim fathers to leave the home of their ancestors to settle in the wilds of America, and there to lay the foundation of a new nationality, which has already become the pride of the world and one of the noblest ornaments of history. Each nation, furthermore, has its own mode of thought or thinking. The Germanic mind is speculative and contemplative. The English mind has a practical tendency. The French mind has its exponent in the politeness and affability of the French people. The American mind is characteristic of none of these foreign types of thought, exclusively. On the other hand, it embraces and harmonizes the individualities of all the leading nations on earth. We are, therefore, justified in saying, that one of the leading characteristics of the American nation is a harmonious and well-balanced mind. Experience proves that an intermingling of the races is essential to all progress. China, which has cut itself off from the rest of the world by means of its gigantic wall, has been up to our time the symbol of stability and stagnation. Rome was formed of and held in its embrace the greater part of the known world ; and there has never been a nation in all the past that has made a deeper and more lasting impression on the page of history. England is formed of the Celts, the Anglo-Saxons, the Danes and the Normans. Shakespeare and Milton, as the representatives and intellectual princes of that nation, have built themselves living monuments in the wonder and admiration of the world. The United States is the rendezvous of the world. A person by traveling from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in reality, makes a political tour all around the globe. She receives into her "stomach" the English, the German, the French ; soon they are digested and converted into American blood (nationalized). Again, with this external gathering of political atoms, there is inseparably and indissolubly connected an immigration of thought and a centralization or focalizing of the world's intellectual life.

Practically speaking, what is the influence and work of our country ? There is not a nation on earth upon which the world's

eye rests more steadfastly than on the United States. We have entered on an experiment which never had its parallel in the history of the world. The hope of all liberty is centered in us and our influence, and the wise men of the world are watching the course of our Western Star with joyous and prayerful emotions. The Chinese are arriving in crowds on our Western coast, with compressed feet and cramped minds. They return to their homes freed from their physical and intellectual shackles, to break veteran customs and habits of their own nation, and to infuse into its very heart the vitalizing principles of the United States. Again, there is an unevangelized world behind us—the very place where the Apostles first trumpeted the glad tidings of salvation. May it not be the purpose of Providence to raise a nation which shall illuminate the dark places of the earth? Our country is admirably located to cast its influence abroad with the greatest facility.

History develops what is in man. Its office is to mark out the progress of mankind in civilization—in the arts, sciences, literature, political freedom and religious truth. The admirable attainments made in these different spheres are pointed out to us in our American histories. It but remains for me to add, that our present field of thought is mainly science and religion. It is the duty of the American people earnestly to grasp the advantages they enjoy, to place new stones upon the wall of science, and draw nearer unto the true God. In order to do this, we enjoy the experience and accumulated researches of our predecessors. Newton taught us to apply the line and measure to the glittering orbs anchored in the skies. Faraday, Bacon, Locke, taught us to analyze the universe of matter and mind. We are encouraged in these researches because nature, upon which science is founded, is the work of God. Tennyson imbedded his thoughts and gave us a transcript of his mind in his poems. God externalized *His* thoughts, and gave *us* a transcript of His mind in nature. The deeper and broader our views of nature, the more perfect our knowledge of its author. All science rightly (by the light of revelation) studied, leads to God. They are but so many roads leading to the same centre. Here *history* reaches its goal—the return of the *mind* and *heart* to God.

J. G. N.

STEEP your Sermons in your heart before you preach them.

EULOGY—MILTON.

THE mind of man can be expanded to a very high degree. This, however, is not a sudden act. The noblest faculty with which our Creator has endowed us, does not, in its normal condition, decline with the increase of years, but its energies are increased proportionately. Use does not impair its power. The process of development, which continues without intermission through the years of a lifetime, is one of the most elevating in its results. It raises man into a higher sphere, where his thoughts and inclinations are bent to contemplate and admire objects of purity, and such as are conformable in every respect to the character of a mind thus elevated. In the regions of the ideal world the mental cravings are satisfied, to some extent, and the emotions that follow are pleasurable. The transient scenes of the ever busy world are distracting, but the aspirations of man must rise higher than these, and must be steady in their course. The glorious and triumphant march of intellect can be noticed in the works of science, art and literature, which mark the progress of the ages. Yet these lights of the world, men of genius, are "few and far between." We have the highest admiration for men who have attained an enviable position in the world of letters. Who can estimate the pleasure realized from reading the works of a Shakespeare, or a Milton? Who could claim great literary eminence without being conversant with the great master minds of Germany? It is by studying the works of such men that we attain the highest intellectual development. Our thoughts and actions, the exponents of our characters, depend entirely upon the nature of our training, moral, as well as intellectual. Our intellectual progress is slow and steady; step by step, higher and higher, we ascend in the domains of science and literature. But we are certain of the most cheering satisfaction arising from our efforts if we relax them only for rest. Therefore, none should despair, for "there is no royal road to learning." It is true that some have more appropriate natural gifts than others, but there is no excuse for any one to bury the talent entrusted to him. There are some whose brilliancy of intellect far surpasses that of others, even as the splendor of the sun exceeds that of the constellations of the firmament. But every person has a work suited to his abilities, and of such a character that he will reap abundant success if he meet the requi-

site demands. Poetry is the language of the heart. The purest and sweetest accord is produced by the rhythmic measures of the poet. It soothes the passions and elevates the affections. It is with pleasure that we point to Milton as the highest representative of this art. His figure stands prëminent as embodying the highest degree of culture. Many centuries before him, a country far famed for its relics of literature; and for the vast impetus it gives to intellectual activity, had the proud honor of contesting the birthplace of the great epic poet. Homer was the poet of a rude age; an age in which a blind and superstitious people paid homage to their national deities. It was, however, an age of great philosophers sculptors, and engravers. The student of classical literature finds the most profuse imagery in the Homeric poems. The simple and vivid expressions, characteristic of the people, adorn their pages. The poems he wrote have outlived the centuries gone by, and their thoughts are still as fresh as when they were first sung to the assembled multitude by the Ionian bard. Although he was blind, his imagination was sparkling. The picture in his mind was more vivid than any living scene could exhibit. It is from this source of ancient Grecian lore, that Milton received a great deal of his inspiration, and by the continual sippings of which his whole being was saturated. Milton lived in a time when Christianity diffused its blessed influence. In his youth he was set apart for the study of polite literature, which he grasped with such avidity that he hardly ever retired before twelve at night. At an early age he wrote poetry, not only in his native tongue, but also in Latin, with classic elegance. He enjoyed the benefits of a thorough classical course; and while at the university one of the noblest poems, his "Hymn to the Nativity," was written. But whilst his genius was of the highest order, and whilst it is true that "the poet is born, not made," we must not imagine that he was exempt from the onerous training for his work. The object of his great poem is clearly presented in the opening of the first book.

"Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater man
Restore us and regain the blissful seat."

The fall of man from a state of purity and innocence to that

of abject misery, is portrayed in this poem. The Messiah is the hero who triumphs over Satan, sin, death ; and the race of man, whose ruin Satan had contemplated, is restored to greater happiness than that from which it fell. The character of Satan is described in such terms that will strike the reader with terror. We have a picture of the infernal world with all its horror, as well as of the regions of universal bliss and happiness. The survey of the whole creation by the Almighty, and the scene that follows, is beautiful.

“ No sooner had th’ Almighty ceas’d, but all
The multitude of angels with a shout,
Loud as from numbers without number, sweet
As from blest voices, uttering joy ; heaven rung
With jubilee, and loud hosannas fill’d
Th’ eternal regions.”

Paradise, the seat of action, is adorned with such a redundancy of ornaments that makes it strikingly beautiful. Trees of all kinds flourished in it, and in the midst of them all stood the tree of life. A large river flowing on orient pearl and sands of gold traversed it and watered each plant. Here was a quiet scene of nature of varied view. The strains of the noblest songsters must have been impressive as they warbled their sweet notes in the shady groves. A happier and dearer abode than this, as here depicted, cannot be surpassed anywhere. It was a heaven on earth. The evening worship of our first parents in the great temple of nature, is full of that adoration and reverence to which we are led when contemplating the manifold works of the Creator. What an immense amount of knowledge is comprised in that volume, and how great must be the influence accruing from it if read with deep earnestness of thought ! How deep the devotion of our innermost feelings when we see the beneficence of God in redeeming the race of man, shining forth throughout the entire poem, and his Almighty power engraved on the minutest part of his creation. May it never be said of this poem, that it is more admired than read ; but may millions of hearts continue to beat in unison with the sentiment uttered therein. Who that meditates over the strains of Milton, does not feel that he drank deep at “ Siloa’s brook that flowed fast by the oracle of God.” He survived his health, his sight, the comforts of his home, and the prosperity of his party. He was placed in the midst of a licen-

tious court and held up to the scorn of an inconstant people. His great and majestic mind overcame every calamity. He was chaste and serene amidst all trial and difficulties, and his angelic countenance was but the mirror of those pure and elevated thoughts of his mind and heart. His "Paradise Lost" is immortal, and although the pecuniary advantage was but trifling to him, yet it won for him "golden" opinions from the best writers of the day. Milton lived in an era of great political conflicts; conflicts between liberty and despotism. The great principles established then are existing now, and will continue to do so as long as sweet liberty's tree shall flourish; they have found their way to the depths of American forests, and have kindled an unquenchable fire in the hearts of the oppressed. We are not disposed to idolize a great man, whether living or dead; but no encomiums can be too great for a person who has been "tried in the furnace of affliction and found true; who has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting. He labored for the public good, and looked with lofty disdain on every temptation and danger. He bore a deadly hatred against bigots and tyrants. In this we may most worthily follow his example. He was blind, but he could hear the angelic harmony of that celestial night when the heavenly choir sang, "Glory to God in the highest, Peace on earth and good will toward men." Beneath the mouldering heap his ashes are silently laid, but he occupies his niche of fame besides Shaksepeare and the great poets of intiquity; his faults and mistakes, and his controversial writings, are buried in a merciful oblivion, while the good he did lives after him. M. P.

COLLEGE ITEMS.

THE *Winter Term* opened January 5th, 1874. With very few exceptions all the old students returned, and there was a considerable accession of new students for this season of the year. The list for the term reaches the encouraging number of nearly ninety. All appear to be glad to be back again at their work, and are diligently prosecuting their studies. Everything indicates progressive and solid prosperity.

AN ERROR CORRECTED.—In a small exchange received from Lancaster, *Ursinus College* is classed among several others which are represented as auxiliaries and adjuncts to Franklin and Marshall in Lancaster. This is a very grave mistake. *Ursinus College* claims to stand on its own foundation, and to work independently of any other institution for the cause to which it is consecrated. Without making any lofty pretensions, it acknowledges no subordinate auxiliary relation to any self-constituted *central* school. It owes fealty to no one but the Lord and the church. And its friends have reason to rejoice that both are greatly favoring its efforts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—For the many kind and liberal remembrances of friends who have recently contributed to our Educational (and Beneficiary) cause, we are sincerely thankful. They greatly encourage us in our work, and cheer those who are thus enabled to prepare themselves for the duties of the ministry. Further assistance in this way is earnestly solicited.

Rev. E. J. Fogel.....	\$50 00
Rev. F. F. Bahner, Milton.....	75 00
Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, Lebanon.....	50 00
Rev. A. Wanner, Mt. Zion.....	10 00
Rev. F. S. Lindaman, Blain.....	20 00
A friend, per Rev. G. Wolff.....	6 00
Rev. A. B. Shenkel, Millersville.....	29 25
Abraham Wagner, near Reading.....	20 00
Rev. R. S. Apple, Hamburg.....	27 75
Rev. George Wolff.....	25 00
Rev. H. A. Keyser, (Nov. 5th, 1873).....	50 00

EDITORS' DESK.

Double thanks to the friends who have cheered us in our work by procuring *new subscribers*, and *promptly paying up for the year*. Both are needful in sustaining such periodicals. Judging from frequent appeals in our exchange papers, our enterprise has no more reason to complain than others, and, considering our inability to employ a business agent, perhaps less reason. Sincere thanks, therefore, we repeat to the many friends who have given substantial

proof of their appreciation of the service rendered by the *Reformed Church Monthly* to the cause of evangelical Christianity in our church.

Thanks, also, to the many brethren and friends who, in remitting money, have added warm and inspiring words of hearty approval and encouragement. We are half tempted to give extracts from such letters, written by old ministers and by younger ones, by *elders* of the church, who have given proof of their love to her true faith and character by years of service, and by liberal donations of money, now considered worse than lost, and by laymen equally devoted to her interests. But to do so might savor of vanity. We, therefore, let our sincere thanks suffice until this general acknowledgment of the favor.

Let the encouraging example thus set be imitated by others. Still wider coöperation is needed, and, we trust, will be given by all in sympathy with our endeavors.

Beware of deceptive pleas for Peace.—It is, indeed, something to be ardently desired and prayed for. It is something to secure which everything should be done that can be done, without sacrificing principles and truth. But it is better even to *contend* for the faith than to abandon it to error.

And yet some of the followers (at a distance) of the Lancaster-Mercersburg party, are trying to get up among the people a feeling for peace—a desire to make the opposition to Lancaster errors unpopular, on the ground that such opposition is keeping the church in constant agitation and interfering with our proper work.

Let those to whom the true life and faith of the church are dear, beware of such pleas. They are deceptive. They are made, also, at a time when they come in very awkwardly.

Lancaster has been finding that it cannot carry its doctrines and measures *just now*. The church has been aroused to a sense of the wrong of those measures and the error of those doctrines. Some of the friends of Lancaster see that their cause is in peril; that the Lancaster Faculty has gone too far, *for the present*, and is unable to defend itself; that it is in a bad predicament. *Now* comes the cry for peace, for dropping the controversy, &c.

The case is a very plain one. And yet some may be deluded by the plausible way in which the plea for peace is made. The disturbers of our peace are not those who are striving to maintain and defend the faith and principles of the church—to keep the church from being changed in her very life and doctrines—but those are the real disturbers who have for years been agitating the church with their attempts materially to alter her true faith and religious character.

Furthermore, the matters in controversy are not trifles—not things of secondary importance, about which difference of opinion might well be tolerated. Recent apostasies to Popery, and other defections, have clearly shown that the controversy virtually involves the question: Shall we continue Evangelical Reformed, or shall we become more or less Roman Catholics? The church must decide; and that it may do so, it must be informed.

An Awkward Retreat.—Our Lancaster friends have found it impossible to defend their development claims against the proofs that their theology is not a legitimate development or carrying out of Reformed doctrines, but a surrender and betrayal of those doctrines, mainly, into the hands of Romanists and old Lutherans. They are out of all patience with being held so strictly to the point. Unable to do any better, and unwilling to confess their failure to maintain their pretensions, they *decline any further discussion of the subject*. Somewhat to cover the real character of this retreat, an unwarranted reason is given for it. Our January article, "Evading Issues," is represented as *passionate* and *angry*. This was news to us. Instead of having written it in anger, we were really in the best humor when it was penned, though as really in earnest. That our Lancaster friend may have been somewhat ruffled in reading it, is quite possible. But he should not have ascribed his own excitement to the article.

One more word. After this it is to be hoped that Lancaster will no more deceive itself, or others, by mistaking and misrepresenting radical departures from the faith, and bold opposition to it, for historical development. It is to be hoped, also, that its true character in this respect will now be fairly understood and admitted. No more sailing under false colors.

Lancaster logic is as faulty and absurd as some of its theology. Here is a sample of it:

The theology of that school has been proven, by its own language, to teach many serious errors, and, among the rest, a very hurtful form of pantheism. In proof of this, its frequent use of such phrases and terms as "organic conjunction" of the Godhead with human nature as a whole; "an inward conjunction in a real way;" "the incorporation" of the substance of the Godhead in Christ "into the actual outflowing life-stream of the world;" "the coalescence of the two orders of existence," the divine and the human, "*into one*;" "the actual coming together," in this way, "of the human and the divine;" "man is an emanation from the being of God," &c.

Now, in reply to this overwhelming proof, the Faculty at Lancaster, unable to defend itself, turns around upon us, and charges that in a book of ours *we* use terms and expressions which amount to the same thing. The book referred to was written in **1858**, more than *fifteen years* ago, a fact which our honorable friend forgot to state. This fact we wish to emphasize, because it serves to show that even then, with all our desire to avoid breaking with our Mercersburg brethren, and all the influence which a misplaced personal confidence and regard had upon our mind and heart, we kept clear of their errors.

Why does the Faculty refer to this book, and so largely quote from it? Plainly, for one of two reasons, or for both. Either it wishes to make the impression that the book, as quoted, teaches the errors we have exposed and denounced as being pantheistic, or it wishes to get us and others away from looking at its errors to a defense of its attack on us. It wishes to get up a diversion, under which it may escape from its unpleasant predicament. Is this another specimen of Lancaster Jesuitry in logic?

Whatever it is, there is no difficulty in meeting the attack and repelling it.

1. We deny that the quotations made from the book referred to, contain any such doctrine as is taught by the terms and phrases cited from the writings of the Lancaster school. Any one can see this by comparing the two. And however poor an opinion we may have of the Faculty's discernment, we can hardly bring ourselves to think that Dr. T. G. Apple did not see this fact. He ought to know that the doctrine of a "real and living union with Christ" is a very different thing from teaching an "organic conjunction of the Godhead with man," and teaching that regeneration is effected by "an emanation from the life-substance of God," transmitted through baptism. *We believe he does know it.*

2. Even if in 1858-9 we had taught such an abominable error, or even had advocated "the cursed idolatry of the mass" (as our Catechism justly calls it)—is that any reason why we should be held to the error now? or is that any excuse for Lancaster teaching it?

Paul was once a fanatical Pharisee. Did that bind him hand and foot, body and soul, always to remain a Pharisee? All men by nature are children of the devil. Does that oblige them forever to continue such?

This may be Lancaster logic. But, happily, it is not the logic of good common sense, or of better grace.

3. But the artifice of the Faculty is of no avail. At the right time, if needful, we can show that the very book of 1858-9 referred to, was aimed both against the baptistic and baptismal regeneration errors. Just now, however, is not the time for that. At present we have to do with Lancaster pantheism and its other false doctrines; and we shall hold the Faculty to a better vindication of itself than it has yet given, or to a confession of the charge brought against it.

Neither Dr. A., nor any of his confederates, shall tempt us away from exposing the bad foundation of their theory, by setting fire to any "hay and stubble" we may have piled up on the old and true foundation. If we ever did gather such miserable stuff from the Mercersburg-Lancaster field, and try to build a house of it, it ought to burn down; and we will most cheerfully "let it go" to ashes, only glad to see it consumed so soon. No attempt to put out the flames shall divert us from the far more important work of exposing the stubble-house on a sandy foundation, into which Lancaster is striving to pervert Reformed Christianity, and to persuade it to take refuge.

Corrections.—By a printing mistake, the *terms* for clubs of six are given, on the title-page of the January and some preceding numbers, as \$1.50. This should be \$10.50, as in the advertisement on the second page of cover.

In the *contents* for January number, on cover, the first article is announced as *The Enduring World*—read *Word*. A number of other typographical errors have been discovered, but in most cases the reader would easily detect and correct them. In December, however, a quotation in the article, *What is It?* was accredited to *Dr. Gans*, instead of *Gass*—a rather ludicrous mistake.

BOOK NOTICES.

From Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York, Exodus, &c., By B. F. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter.

This volume includes all of "*The Speaker's Commentary*," relating to the Book of Exodus. It is issued in this form for the convenience of Sunday-schools studying the International Series, and will be found a most valuable aid in the study of this portion of the Bible. The notes, maps, and special dissertations, embody the results of the most recent researches and investigations, and impart a value to the work not possessed by any similar one now before the public.

The Bibliotheca Sacra.—This standard theological quarterly enters upon its thirty-first volume with the January number, which presents articles on the following topics: *Theology, a Possible Science*, by Dr. Thomas Hill, ex-president of Harvard University; *Galilee, in the Time of Christ* by Rev. Serah Merrill; *Natural Realism*, by Rev. J. Macbride Sterrett; *Book Rarities at Washington*, by Frederic Vinton; *The Hebrew Tense*, by Rev. Dr. A. B. Rich; *The Natural Basis of our Spiritual Language*, by Dr. W. M. Thomson, of the Syrian Mission; *Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament*, by Rev. G. H. Whittemore; *Letters from Halle, Leipsic and Heidelberg*, *Notices of New Publications*. The high character of this able quarterly is well sustained by this number, and its value to the theologians is as great as ever. W. F. Draper, Andover, Mass. \$4 a year.

MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR OWN CHURCH—*Changes in the Ministry.*—Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock to Stone church, Northampton county, Pa.

Rev. F. P. Hartmetz to Sharon, Mercer county, Pa.

Rev. E. H. Otting to Warren, Trumbull county, Ohio.

Rev. H. Hanhart to 372, Central Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Rev. F. W. Steffens to Galveston, Texas.

ADDITIONS TO CHURCHES.—Kittaning Mission, Rev. D. S. Diffenbacher, pastor, 43 were added. South Bethlehem, Pa., 32 were added. Southwest, Ind., Rev. J. B. Ruhl, pastor, 13 were added. Tartelton charge, Ohio, Rev. J. S. Gough, pastor, 5 were added. Millersburg, Ind., 3 were added. Farmersville, Ohio, Rev. L. Rike, pastor, 5 were added. Duncannon, Pa., Rev. H. Wisler, pastor, 12 were added. St. Jacob's church, Lisbon, Ohio, 9 were added. Newmanstown, Pa., Rev. T. C. Leinbach, pastor, 18 were added. South Bethlehem, Rev. N. Z. Snyder, pastor, 26 were added. St.

Mark's congregation, New Hamburg, 6 were added. Mt. Union congregation, during the present pastorate of six months, 65 were added.

INSTALLATIONS.—Rev. Dr. G. W. Mudder was installed on New Year's day, pastor of St. James' congregation, by a committee of the Allegheny Classis.

Rev. J. H. Sykes has been installed pastor of the Woodcock Valley charge.

CHURCH NEWS.—*During Christmas week* the Sunday-schools of Lebanon, Myerstown, Philadelphia, Trappe, Brownbacks, Slatington, Millersville, and many other congregations had appropriate and highly interesting celebrations. Such celebrations, rightly managed, may be made not only pleasant and cheering, but instructive and profitable. It is evident, however, that constant care is needful to keep them from running out and down into seasons of mere fun and frolic—Popish ceremonies under Protestant patronage. A Christmas festival should at least be Christian, whether in the family or in the Sunday-school; and everything calculated to pervert the Christian element, or to crowd it out by the introduction of things utterly foreign to the great and blessed fact and truths commemorated, should be excluded. In this view, the plan adopted in the Lebanon church (Dr. Kremer's) of suitable recitations by the school, is to be commended.

Reformed Church at Slatington, Pa., Rev. L. K. Derr, pastor. It was our privilege to assist brother Derr at a communion on Sunday, January 25th. The visit afforded a good opportunity of seeing the great success attending his labors in Slatington. The congregation in Slatington was organized only about four years ago, chiefly through the zeal of Rev. Dr. Helfrich. Brother Derr became the first pastor of the charge. A new church edifice has been erected (a union house, Reformed and Lutheran) which is nearly paid for, and the number of communicants has nearly doubled, being now about 175. This rapid growth is the more remarkable, as the parent church, of which that in Slatington is an offshoot, is situated within about one mile of the outer limits of the town. During both the services, morning German, and evening English, the house was quite filled, although the weather was intensely cold, and the roads were immensely rough, so as to keep away many members from the country. In the afternoon we attended the Sabbath school, and were surprised and delighted to find so large a school, thirty-three classes, averaging some eight members each, and conducted with so much spirit and excellent order. The Slatington congregation adheres with firm and intelligent love and zeal to the old faith and principles of the church, and could not be easily persuaded to barter them for any specious novelties.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—*A remarkable Bible class.* About three years ago R. F. Kelker, esq., of Harrisburg, Pa., took charge, by special request, of the Bible class of the First Reformed church in that city. At the time the class numbered less than twenty young ladies and gentlemen. Under the charge of the new teacher it grew so rapidly that it became necessary to remove from the Sunday-school room to the church. In a little more than one year the number of members had increased to 128, and from the *Souvenir of the class for 1873*,

a beautifully gotten up and exceedingly interesting pamphlet, we learn that during the past year the whole number in attendance was 179, viz: Eighty-four ladies and ninety-five gentlemen. What a power for good is the opportunity thus afforded. And how gratifying to know, that it is in the hands of so evangelical, earnest and zealous an Elder of the church. May the rich blessing of the Lord continue to rest upon the work, cheering the heart of this faithful laborer, and crowning the efforts put forth with still more abundant success.

The Christian Intelligencer contributes the following to the Bishop Cummins controversy:

Is Bishop Cummins Guilty of Schism?

Two very different sorts of offences are covered by the one name of "schism." The first offense is real, and gets its name of "schism" from Scripture, where, however, it is mentioned at most but three times. Twice St. Paul charges the Corinthians with schisms ("divisions," according to our version), 1 Cor. 1: 10; 11: 18; and once the word "schism" is retained by our translators to describe an imaginary feud among the members of a human body (1 Cor. 12, 25). The figurative relation of this last passage to the "body of Christ" gives the word the same meaning here as in the two verses above named. New Testament schism, then, was nothing else than an uncharitable party spirit, though nourished within the same visible organization or "body." Of course if such party spirit should go on and rend the organized church, the division of feeling—the true "schism"—would underlie and qualify the outward rending. But this outward division, of itself, and entirely apart from that wicked motive, would be a schism of another sort. It would be, that is, a formal partition of the church, as a society organized and administered under a given set of human rules and officers.

Now, it is to this last named and formal division of the church, as an organized body, that ecclesiastical law has come to apply the New Testament word. And the application is entirely just in all those cases in which the formal division of the organized church is the direct product and sign of a spirit of strife.

But the question now arises, whether external divisions in a church may not sometimes be even demanded on grounds of prudence and of loyalty to Christ; so that such divisions shall sustain no relation whatever to the uncharitable opposition of parties—the only schism known to the New Testament?

At this question two roads meet, and opinions divide. High-churchmen of every sort, from the Pope down, insist that church organization and transmitted grace are so sacred that nothing but party spirit could dream of external separation from "the church." And if we admit their theory, they are right in their conclusion. A well arm is not to be cut off, even from a sickly trunk; for there is only one heart, and that the arm could not take with it.

But others say: It is not a lineal succession of church officers, nor any human transmission of divine grace, that makes the church. The Catholic visible church consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion. They further insist that, as things now are in the world, the inte-

rests of the true religion require some diversities in the administration of this great body of believers; so that those men who conscientiously and with charity arrange for a separate administration of church ordinances and authority within the general law of Christ, though they may sometimes be chargeable with mistakes or even with folly, are not chargeable with schism, except in that factitious ecclesiastical sense that lacks all endorsement from the words or spirit of the New Testament.

For our part, we consider this latter position to be unassailable. When the members of a church leave it only for the conscientious purpose of securing another ecclesiastical organization, which, equally with the first, shall be within the church universal, and which, by its homogeneity and its sounder doctrine or more evangelical spirit, shall save some important interest of religion from apparent peril; when such men effect their departure with as little violence as the case admits, and with perfect charity toward those whom they leave behind, they are no more to be charged with schism than with quarrelsome and bitterness, which are the unfailing accompaniment of real schism.

In a word, truly Protestant Christians, in speaking of schism and schismatics, will do well to pay great deference to the inspired definition and rebuke of schism, and to stop there. The man-made, high-church notion of a schism, committed *ipso facto* in separating without consent, is as absurd among Protestant denominations as an awe of *jure divino* kingship would be among republicans. Our churches have no use nor place for such a figment. By its own definition it contemplates separation from "the church;" and "the church" with us is the whole church, so that separation from that is a forsaking of the profession of the true religion. Bishop Cummins certainly has not reached that pass.

Those moderate Episcopalians, then, and others who talk about him as a schismatic, should consider where they are putting Luther and Calvin, and Robinson and Wesley.

The grotesqueness of this new separation lies in the fact that it is bent both on leaving what exclusives call "the church," and on taking it along. Whichever of these inconsistent things it may do at last, it is absurd for any Protestant to call it a schism.

In a certain Scotch parish, the grave-digger was also an officer of the parish. Suspicion had for some time been entertained that he had been in the habit of abstracting some of the alms from the alm-box. The elders told the minister something must really be done. The minister said, "Leave him to me, and I'll see what can be done." The following Sunday, after the forenoon service, the minister was taking off his gown and band, and being alone in the vestry with the unsuspected man, thought the opportunity too good to be lost; so he said, "Andrew, have you heard of the money that is missing from the box?" "Oh, ay," said Andrew, "I was hearing something about it." "Andrew," continued the other very gravely, "the matter lies between you and me. We are the only two who have access to the box. Either you or I must be the thief." "Deed, sir," rejoined the imperturbable Andrew, "It's just as you say, we're the only two that has access to the box, and I think the best way'll be for you

to pay the tae half and I pay the tither and say nae mair aboot it.—*Churchman*.

The religious faculty is as old as history. In the barbarism of the past, this faculty, like all others, is the slave of ignorance. The religion of Zoroaster is, perhaps, the oldest of which we have any knowledge. Like the leaf of the modest fern, that has left its impress upon the coal measures, so much of the good, and pure, and true that Zoroaster taught his followers, made its impress upon succeeding ages. "I invoke and worship benevolence, purity, and a worthy life," said a Persian prayer. "The wise man," said Buddha, "cherishes reflection as his jewel." "Without meditation there is no knowledge." Socrates, Plato, Confucius, and many others, who lived long before the Christian era, uttered many religious truths, which are living principles to-day. The world is better for their having lived in it.

There is a set of people (says Chalmers) whom I cannot bear—the pinks of fashionable propriety—whose every word is precise, and whose every movement is unexceptionable; but who, though versed in all the categories of polite behavior, have not a particle of soul or cordiality about them. There may be elegance in every gesture, not a smile out of place; but what I want is the heart and gaiety of social intercourse—the frankness that spreads ease and animation around it—the eye that speaks affability to all, that chases timidity from every bosom, and tells every man in the company to be confident and happy.

Lunacy and Thinking.—There is no nation where madness is so rare as in Turkey, where the people of all others, think the least. In France, Germany and England—countries distinguished for intellectual activity—the number of suicides is greater than in any other countries.—*Medical Times and Gazette*.

"*Self-possession*, based upon a sufficient preparation, is the whole secret of success in extemporaneous speaking." A chapter is condensed in this one sentence, taken from Dr. Abel Stevens' work on the "Preaching Required by the Times." Most of our great extemporaneous preachers "are able because they think themselves able."

Ecclesiastical Reform.—Lord Verulam (whom many persons still persist in styling Lord Bacon) asks "why the Civil State should be purged and restored, by good and wholesome laws, made in every third or fourth Parliament, providing remedies as fast as time breedeth mischiefs, and contrariwise, the Ecclesiastical State should continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration?"

The Church Journal says that the clergy are no longer honored for their work's sake, as they once were, and adds: "A clergyman with the learning of Origen or Jerome, would starve in the American church unless he had the capacity to be delighted in society, to preside properly at sewing societies, conduct a Sunday-school, and hold his own at vestry meetings."

There is danger to Christianity, but it does not approach from the direction

of Spiritualist Conventions at Chicago, or elsewhere. It comes from the lowered tone of Christian consecration, and the lowered standard of Christian consistency. The evil to be feared is from within rather than from without. A truthful, prayerful devoted career of duty is an argument which stultifies all the rhetoric and logic both, of the most eloquent of this class of radicals. It is to these like the autumn frost to the swarms of insects. It spoils all that they compliment with the name of reasoning. Let the Spirit of God be out-poured upon our churches; let such Pentecostal seasons return as have been more than once repeated in our Presbyterian history, and the voice of a mis-named "Spiritualism"—as material as any Gospel of despair—would die away to its last echo. It would be dismissed to oblivion as idle breath, and history, overcharged already with memorials of crusading atheists and insane defiers of revelation, would decline to accept any new encumbrances. The simple fact, of which these deluded enthusiasts seem to be utterly unconscious, is that the life of Christianity is beyond the reach, not only of the edicts of a Julian and the wit of a Voltaire, but of the most strenuous efforts of their futile malice.

A missionary in his report as to the field of his labor, says, "Methinks one reading this report says, 'Well, I will give five dollars to the cause of domestic missions. I can give this amount and not feel it.' Suppose, my Christian brother, you give twenty, and feel it? Your Saviour felt what he did for you. A remark of this kind once heard from the pulpit, thrilled through my whole soul, and made me do more than empty my purse. I borrowed from a friend. The idea of feeling what I gave was delightful."

A missionary at a station in South Africa, connected with the Scotch Free church, speaks of a recent revival at his station in connection with a week of special prayer. Whole nights were spent by some of the people on the hills in sending up their united cries to God for his presence and the outpouring of his spirit. As a fruit of this effort the church was greatly revived, and fifty-three new-born souls added to the church.

The most important mission of the London Missionary Society in the South Sea Islands was begun by the martyred Williams. Seventeen years passed, and nothing seemed to be accomplished. The board grew weary of delay, and it was moved to abandon the enterprise. One only withstood this—the late Dr. Haweis, author of the *Communicant's Spiritual Companion*—who persuaded them on the contrary, to increase appropriations and prayers; and almost immediately after this resolution was adopted, tidings came of that great work by which a "nation was born in a day" into that kingdom of God:

The friends of Pompey, when he was about to embark for the purpose of conveying provisions to the famishing people in Rome, endeavored to dissuade him from exposing himself to the perils of the sea voyage. He nobly replied, "*Necesse est, ut eam, non ut vivam*—it is necessary that I should go, not that I should live." A grand sentiment, though all men cannot appreciate it. It is the sentiment of the heroic missionary who exposes his life to inhospitable climes, and to barbarous and bigoted people for the good of souls. And this

rich, self-denying benevolence, has cheered many a one in a dying hour, and prompted the exclamation, "I have no regrets for what I have done. Oh that I had done more for Jesus and for souls !

A letter from London says that Mr. Spurgeon's health makes it necessary that he should soon leave England for a few months' residence in a more congenial clime.

Native Christian chapels have been so far constructed along the 2,000 miles of the sea coast of China, that for 800 miles of that coast a footman might put up at a Christian chapel each night of the journey.

The Pacific says the California Congregational churches have taken a step forward in organizing a woman's board of missions for the Pacific coast, and already local auxiliary societies are forming at different points.

The managers of the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance are rejoicing in the circumstance that they succeeded in carrying it through without leaving a disagreeable debt on hand. The Conference paid for itself, besides paying those who went to it.

The Lee Avenue Baptist church in Brooklyn, Rev. J. Hyatt Smith's, has taken a still more definite stand on the open communion question, and declares that, with its present convictions, it cannot retrace its steps, even though the penalty be the withdrawal of recognition by the denomination.

The Prussian Government has absolutely resolved to abstain from any interference with the inner ecclesiastical organization of the dioceses during its struggle with the Romish church, and to confine its action to rigorously repelling any encroachments of the bishops upon state rights.

The Presbytery of Egypt, in connection with the United Presbyterian church, transacts its business and keeps its records in the Arabic language. At a late meeting there were present, as members of Presbytery, eight ministers (six of whom were missionaries and two natives) and five native elders.

Rev. S. H. Tyng, jr., is meeting with great success in securing large congregations to his Sunday evening sermons in Cooper Institute. He delivers extemporaneous prayers, and his discourses are eminently practical. The singing is congregational.

The American Bible Society has appointed the Rev. Bishop W. L. Harris, D.D., LL. D., of the Methodist church, who is now abroad, a delegate to the British and Foreign Bible Society, at their anniversary to be held in May. The whole number of volumes granted since the last meeting of the American Bible Society is 4,804, including 10 volumes for the blind, besides others, to the value of \$3,133.85. This was for the domestic work. For the work abroad 13,252 volumes were granted in books, and \$2,200 in funds.

The Jesuit missionaries in Madagascar are making rapid progress in their work. According to statistics given in one of their publications, they have now seventy-four places of worship in the central province, and forty-four priests, sisters of mercy and teachers in Antananarivo and vicinity. Their work already extends to nearly every important village.

Great interest is now awakened for Christianizing the Jews. More than \$300,000 were contributed in Great Britain alone, the past year, for this object. In Jerusalem there are sixty Jewesses meeting daily to hear the Gospel; ministers are now welcomed in every house at Jerusalem. Within the last sixty years, since the establishment of the society, 25,000 people have been converted to the Christian religion.

Rev. Dr. Cheney, lately consecrated a Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal church, administered the rite of confirmation, on Sabbath, the 4th inst., in Christ church, of which he has been rector for some years, in Chicago. He performed the service according to the form adopted by the new church.

Dr. Dollinger, the well-known German professor and opponent of the Papal Infallibility assumption, hearing recently that his former Roman Catholic friends had circulated the report that he had repented of his course and wished to be reconciled to the Pope, at once said, in terms which none could misunderstand, "It is an Ultramontane lie."

Lord Lawrence, late English Viceroy and Governor-General of India, uses this strong language in regard to foreign missionaries there: "I believe, notwithstanding all that the English people have done to benefit that country, the missionaries have done more than all agencies combined."

Dean Stanley, whose scholarship and position well entitle him to be considered of good authority on any question relating to Episcopacy, said in a sermon which he preached in a late visit to Edinburgh, that, as a matter of history, the apostles had no successors. Where, then, it may be asked, is the famous Roman Catholic and Episcopal doctrine of Apostolic Succession?

Ex-Marshal Bazaine, who has been made to know much of the vicissitudes of human life, has had the death-sentence which was passed upon him by the court-martial that tried him for treason, changed to twenty years' exile and confinement, and has been sent for this purpose to Sainte Marguerite, a fort on a small island in the Mediterranean, off the coast of France, and not far from the Cannes.

The congregation of the Madison Square Presbyterian church of New York city (Rev. Dr. Adams having resigned to assume the Presidency of the Union Theological Seminary) on Monday evening voted unanimously to call Rev. Joseph T. Duryea, D.D., of Brooklyn, with a salary of \$8,000, and \$2,000 additional for house rent. A committee, of which Dr. Adams is chairman, was appointed to present the call.

Prof. James Strong, S. T. D., of Drew Seminary, sailed from New York city on the 20th ult., in the *Oceanic*, accompanied by an engineer, a photographer, and several archæological students. The party will spend a short time in Europe, visiting points of archæological interest, and then proceed to the East, to spend several months in journeying over the ground lately discovered by Tristram in his Land of Moab. They will also travel in the desert and Upper Egypt.

The plan of many ministers in devoting the evening sermon, or the Wednesday evening lecture to the lesson of the school for the following Sunday is well calculated to advance all the interests of the church. It interests all in the particular subject under consideration, and helps to concentrate the thoughts of old and young, making them mutual helpers and searchers after those precious truths which exalt families and nations.

The International Lesson Committee is to meet in Philadelphia next month, to select lessons for 1875. It is understood that the lessons for the first half of the year are to be from the Old Testament, commencing with the book of Joshua, and for the last half in the gospel of John. The committee invite at all times suggestions from Sunday-school teachers and writers as to the number of lessons to be taken from any one book of the Bible, or the subject and length of particular lessons. Rev. John H. Vincint, of New York, is chairman, and Rev. Dr. Warren Randolph, of Philadelphia, secretary of this committee.

The following appears in the editorial columns of the *Independent* this week : "There is no truth whatever in the reports published in the daily papers that the *Independent* has been sold. No change whatever has occurred in its proprietorship or editorial management, and there is no prospect of any. It is true, however, that several very flattering and unsolicited proposals to purchase the paper have been recently made to us, from highly respectable parties; but they have all been respectfully declined."

Bishop Reinkens has issued a reply to the Pope's Encyclical, in which the following passage occurs: "The Pope who was most feared, and who was surrounded with the greatest splendor on earth, Innocent III., condemned the English Magna Charta, cursed it, appealed to the heavenly and terrestrial powers against it, and struck it with his anathema and interdict. Nevertheless, the Magna Charta did not fall; it made the people of England great; and who will say that the English nation has lost its Christianity?"

Dr. Parker, in his first sermon after his return home from the recent Alliance, made the following declaration: "It is not very agreeable to my patriotic impulse to say—and yet I must say it—that America is, in my opinion, on the point of laying its hand on the supremacy of the world. England has a magnificent history, but America has a still more magnificent future."

Juggernaut, the chief god of millions of the human family, is a coarse clump of wood, with a small box of quicksilver inside for a spirit.

As the highest estimate of the number of children now belonging to Sunday-schools in the United States is only 5,000,000, and assuming that the school age is from four years to twenty, which would give 15,000,000 children and youth in the country, it is evident that the American Sunday-school Union has a great field and a great work before it in establishing and sustaining new schools. Whenever its claims are brought up, these facts and figures should be recalled.

The Marquis and Marchioness of Bute, accompanied by Monsignor Capel, have both left England for Rome. It is said that their visit is connected with the establishment of a Roman Catholic university in England. If the scheme receives the sanction of the Pope, the Roman Catholic aristocracy have promised to give large pecuniary assistance. The Marquis of Bute's contribution will be £50,000.

The union of religious benevolent societies having similar work to do is now urged in many quarters. Consolidation is the order of the day, to promote harmony, efficiency and economy. A few men having personal interests at stake oppose such unions; but they must come, and the few should yield gracefully to the evident necessity.

Professor Christleib, at Bonn, Dr. Grundemann, pastor, at Morz, and Dr. Warneck at Barmen, propose to edit and publish a German Missionary Review, discussing all questions relating to the work of Christian missions, civilization and human progress. Such a periodical in such hands will command the attention of the religious world.

Call Declined.—Rev. J. B. Date, D.D., pastor of the Second United Presbyterian church of Philadelphia, on Sunday last, announced to his congregation that he had declined the call to a professorship in the Theological Seminary of Newburg, New York. The congregation indorsed his action by a rising vote.

Private Confession.—Dr. Pusey affirms that while the formularies of the Church of England do not justify any parish priest in requiring private confession as a condition of receiving the holy communion, yet all who claim the privilege of private confession are entitled to it.

Rev. Dr. Chambers, one of the Collegiate church pastors in the city of New York, is about to take a tour of Egypt and the Holy Land. We have no doubt it will prove a profitable tour both to himself and his people.

Rev. Dr. Kingston Goddard, formerly of New York, and more recently rector of an Episcopal church on Staten Island, has joined, it is announced, the Reformed Episcopal church movement. Numerous others, who are Low church men are spoken of.

There are more than sixty thousand Protestant churches in the United States. There are about three thousand Roman Catholic churches. These are facts to think of when estimating the power of religion in this country.

URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

WINTER TERM. 1874.

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The NEXT TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, commences Monday, JANUARY 5th, 1874, and continues sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. The sessions of both correspond. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M.; Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A.M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A.M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

H. T. SPANGLER, A.B., and J. H. SECHLER, A.B., Instructors in the Academic Department.

A. E. DAHLMAN, Tutor.

H. J. WELKER, Instructor in Penmanship.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.



"EVERY MAN HAS HIS INFLUENCE."

"A man may take a neeber's part,
Yet hae nae cash to spare him."—*Scotsman.*

Please be good enough to recommend your friends to come to OAK HALL for

MEN'S OR BOYS' CLOTHING,

and oblige, Yours truly,

WANAMAKER & BROWN,

**THE LARGEST CLOTHING HOUSE IN AMERICA,
S. E. Corner 6th and Market Streets,
PHILADELPHIA.**

We believe our Clothing excels, because of its

EXCELLENCE OF FIT.

TRUE VALUE FOR MONEY PAID.

SUPERIOR TRIMMINGS.

WEAR-RESISTING PROPERTIES.

SUBSTANTIAL MATERIALS.

FAITHFUL WORKMANSHIP.

FASHIONABLE STYLES.

WANAMAKER & BROWN.

 Samples and Rules for self measurement sent to any address when written for.